



LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Case

Division BS2420

Shelf

Section L275

Book

Vol. VI

THE LIFE
OF
THE LORD JESUS CHRIST:

A COMPLETE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGIN, CONTENTS,
AND CONNECTION OF

THE GOSPELS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

J. P. LANGE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.

EDITED, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES,

BY

THE REV. MARCUS DODS, A.M.

IN SIX VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH:

T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

LONDON: HAMILTON AND CO. DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.

MDCCCLXIV.



THE LIFE
OF
THE LORD JESUS CHRIST:
A COMPLETE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGIN, CONTENTS,
AND CONNECTION OF
THE GOSPELS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF
J. P. LANGE, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.

VOLUME I.

TRANSLATED BY
SOPHIA TAYLOR.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
LONDON: HAMILTON AND CO. DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON AND CO.
MDCCCLXIV.

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

	Page
EDITOR'S PREFACE,	ix
AUTHOR'S PREFACE,	9

FIRST BOOK.

THE INTRODUCTION.

PART I.—THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

SECT. 1. The Incarnation of God,	25
2. The Personality of Man,	43
3. Organism in the Province of Personal Human Life,	51
4. The Fulness of the Time,	58
5. The Ideality of the Gospel History,	65
6. The Effect of the Ideal History: The Sacred Remembrance,	93

PART II.—THE MORE GENERAL RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF THE LORD JESUS.

SECT. 1. General Survey,	100
2. The New Testament,	102
3. The Old Testament,	104
4. The Theocracy, especially the Christian Church,	107
5. The Spiritual Life of Mankind,	112

PART III.—THE HISTORIC RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

	Page
SECT. 1. The Phenomenon of the Four Gospels,	119
2. The Four Gospels as Records of the Life of Christ, . . .	125

PART IV.—CRITICISM OF THE TESTIMONIES TO THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

SECT. 1. General Survey,	129
2. The Gospel History as Criticism,	129
3. Antagonistic Criticism in general,	132
4. Antagonistic Criticism in its subordinate Principles and Aspects,	133
5. Antagonistic Criticism in its Dialectic Dealings, . . .	149
6. Antagonistic Criticism, in its intermixture of Contradictory Assumptions and Opposite Modes of Treatment, . . .	156
7. The Christian Theological Criticism of the Gospel Narratives, . . .	159

PART V.—THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

SECT. 1. The Ecclesiastical Corroboration of the Four Gospels in general,	165
2. The Authenticity of the First Gospel,	174
3. The Authenticity of the Second Gospel,	179
4. The Authenticity of the Third Gospel,	182
5. The Authenticity of the Fourth Gospel,	183

PART VI.—THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

SECT. 1. Various Views of the Origin of the Four Gospels, . . .	219
2. The Origin of the Gospels in general,	224
3. Origin of the Gospels in particular,	231

PART VII.—THE RELATION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS TO THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

SECT. 1. An Attempt to exhibit the Gospel History in its Unity, . .	240
2. The Gospel History in the Organic Fourfold Development of its Fulness,	243

SECOND BOOK.

THE HISTORICAL DELINEATION OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION.

	Page
SECT. 1. The Principal Chronological Periods ascertained, . . .	287
2. The Periods of Christ's Life,	298

PART I.—THE HISTORICAL SPHERE OF CHRIST'S LIFE.

SECT. 1. The Relations of Time and Place among which Christ appeared,	300
2. The Scene of Christ's Life, the Promised Land,	309

PART II.—THE HISTORY OF THE BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF THE LORD JESUS.

SECT. 1. Preliminary Remarks,	324
2. The Angel Gabriel,	326
3. Zacharias,	345
4. The Virgin Mary,	350
5. Mary and Elisabeth,	366
6. The Birth of Jesus at Bethlehem,	375
7. The First Homage, or the Shepherds and the Wise Men, . .	385
8. The Flight into Egypt,	393
9. The Presentation of Jesus in the Temple,	398
10. The Settlement in Nazareth,	402
11. The Fulfilments,	406
12. The Development of Jesus,	409
13. The Family Relations of Jesus,	421

EDITOR'S PREFACE.



THE work of Dr Lange, translated in the accompanying volumes, holds among books the honourable position of being the most complete Life of our Lord. There are other works which more thoroughly investigate the authenticity of the Gospel records, some which more satisfactorily discuss the chronological difficulties involved in this most important of histories, and some which present a more formal and elaborate exegetical treatment of the sources; but there is no single work in which all these branches are so fully attended to, or in which so much matter bearing on the main subject is brought together, or in which so many points are elucidated. The immediate object of this comprehensive and masterly work, was to refute those views of the life of our Lord which had been propagated by Negative Criticism, and to substitute that authentic and consistent history which a truly scientific and enlightened criticism educes from the Gospels. It is now several years since the original work appeared in Germany, but the date of its first appearance will be reckoned a disadvantage only by those who are unacquainted with the recent history of theological literature. No work has in this interval appeared which has superseded, or can be said even to compete with this. So that, while it is no doubt a pity that the English-reading public should not have had access to this work long ago, we have now the

comfort of receiving a book whose merits have been tested, and which claims our attention, not in the doubtful tones of a stripling, but with the authoritative accent of one that has attained his majority.

A cursory notice of the leading works which have more recently been added to this department of literature, may serve both to aid younger students in selecting what may suit their tastes or intentions, and to show that the present work is by no means out of date. And, first of all, there has been issued a new edition (1854) of the work of Dr Karl Hase (*Das Leben Jesu*), originally published in 1829. This book is intended mainly for an academical text-book; and as such its merits are willingly acknowledged. In less than 250 pages this compact volume exhibits, one may say, all the opinions and literature connected with the life of our Lord. As an index to, or compendium of, the whole contents of this department of literature, nothing more can reasonably be desired. This must, of course, be taken with that exception which we have to attach to the majority of German works, in consideration of their ignorance of our own literature. This is manifest in Dr Hase's manual, and sometimes even absurdly so. But, with this exception, there is given in this volume a complete view of all the opinions which have been entertained regarding the ideas and incidents of the life of our Lord, accompanied by copious references to the writings where these opinions are maintained. The style is dense and clear, and the arrangement perspicuous, so that the use of the volume as a text-book is easy. Unfortunately, the author's own opinions are not always such as can be adopted, but must rather be added as one more variety to the mass of opinions he presents to our view. His critical judgments, often useful in demolishing the profanities of the vulgar Rationalism, are themselves tainted with the meagre theology of Schleier-

macher and De Wette. He denies the divinity of Christ, while he considers Him a sinless, perfect man, in whom humanity culminates and is glorified, and by whose doctrine and life the new community is founded. He at once and distinctly enounces his position, saying (p. 15), 'Since the divine can reveal itself in humanity only as veritable human, the perfect image of God only as the religious archetype of man, the life of Jesus must be considered as simple human life; and without giving free and constant play to the human development, we cannot speak of a history of Jesus.' To find such a view held by a man of accomplished critical ability, of vigorous and clear intellect, and great research, is not so surprising as to find it held by one who professes, as Dr Hase does, to take John's Gospel as the most faithful representation of our Lord.

Another work of importance is that of Heinrich Ewald (*Geschichte Christus' und seiner Zeit*, 1st ed. 1854, and 2d, 1857). This forms the fifth volume of the author's History of the Hebrew People, and contains very thorough and instructive discussions of the historical circumstances of the life of Christ. The political condition of the Jews, their internal factions and their relations to the Gentile world, their religious and moral declension, are exhibited with much ability and learning; and the significance of the appearance of our Lord as a Jew in the time and place He did, is brought out with great acuteness and originality. But here again the whole work is blighted by the defective view of our Lord's person, and the unjustifiable treatment of the documentary sources, which have spoiled so much of German criticism. Ewald views Jesus as the fulfilment of the Old Testament,—as the final, highest, fullest, clearest revelation of God,—as the true Messiah, who satisfies all right longing for God and for deliverance from the curse,—as the eternal King of the kingdom of God. But with all this, and

while he depicts our Lord's person and work, in its love, activity, and majesty, with a beauty that is not often met with, there is but one nature granted to this perfect Person, and that nature is human. He is not a man such as the rest of us, not one of the million, but the Sent of God, the Word of God, even the Son of God, prepared for through the ages gone by, attended throughout his life by the power of God, endowed with the highest gifts and imbued with the Spirit of God, so that he speaks out of God and works the works of God;—but still he on whom all this is conferred, through whom God wholly reveals and communicates Himself, and on whom the world in its helplessness hangs, is but a man. In the concluding chapter of the volume (p. 498) occurs the distinct utterance that so many former pages have seemed to contradict:—‘Even the highest divine power, when it wraps itself in a mortal body and appears in a determinate time, finds its limits in this body and this time; and never did Jesus, as the Son and the Word of God, confound himself, or arrogantly make himself equal, with the Father and God.’ Still, this volume is one from which a great deal may be gained. It abounds in noble, elevating thoughts, most eloquently expressed; in sudden gleams into new regions, which fire the soul. The delicate and profound spiritual insight of the author, his sense of many, if not of all, the necessities of a sinful race, enable him to apprehend and depict with wonderful power the perfect humanity of our Lord, and in part the fulfilment of His mission.

A work of very different character appeared at Basle in 1858 from the pen of Professor C. J. Riggensbach. (*Vorlesungen über das Leben des Herrn Jesu.*) These Lectures profess to be popular, and aim throughout at the accurate apprehension of the subject on the part of the hearer, rather than at learned or ostentatious disquisition on the speaker's part. He discards much

of the conventional scientific terminology, as being nothing better than Greek and Latin fig-leaves to hide the nakedness of our knowledge. Through his own veil of popular address, however, it is easy to discern the thews and sinews of a vigorous intellect, and the careful and instructed movement of one who knows and has thoroughly investigated the numerous difficulties of his path. Here and there, too, there is inserted an excursus which enters with greater minuteness into some topic which calls for fuller discussion. In these, the author's strength and culture are more nakedly revealed, and valuable contributions made to the solution of the questions at issue. The characteristics which this work displays, as a whole, are accuracy, taste and judgment, impartiality, reverence and spiritual discernment, and an easy, graceful, and lucid style. It is very much what there is great need of among ourselves,—a volume which should exhibit in a popular form, and in a well-arranged narrative, the results of the immense amount of labour that has recently been spent upon the Gospels.

Such a want can scarcely be said to be supplied by Bishop Ellicott's *Historical Lectures on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ* (Hulsean Lectures for 1859);¹ though he too, proposed to combine 'a popular mode of treating the question under consideration, and accuracy both in outline and detail.' The actual combination is, we fear, too mechanical. A work which is so loaded with foot-notes is in great danger of being unpopular. The narrative flows along the top of the page easily enough, but one is always forgetting, and ignoring its intrinsic value, and counting it merely as a row of pegs to hang the notes upon. The notes themselves are a valuable digest of all the important

¹ The work of Dr Hanna promises well in this direction, but 'finis coronat opus.' And, so far as it goes, M. de Pressensé's '*Le Rédempteur*' is a good popular exhibition of the leading features of the Life of our Lord.

questions which are started by this subject, and present a selection of authorities which renders the volume an admirable guide to the student. In judging of this work, too, we must bear in mind that, until its publication, the English reader had access to no similar volume, except that of Neander. Probably, however, this book is scarcely of the same value, though it may be to many of as much interest, as those admirable commentaries by which the author has won himself so much grateful and affectionate regard, and by which he has done so much to maintain among us a respect for sound theology and Christian scholarship.

And lastly, there is the unhappy work of M. Ernest Renan, (*Vie de Jésus*, 1863), the most deplorable literary mistake of this century. It reveals a lamentable ignorance on the part of the French public, that a book, which in Germany would have been out of date twenty years ago, should now create so much excited interest. But, as we have ourselves been recently taught in this country, it is sometimes the case, that a man makes use of a popular style to introduce as novelties, statements that have been slain and buried among scholars, or to start afresh doubts that belong to a past generation. This appeal to the people, which has been so much practised of late, and which can be made with every appearance of earnestness and honesty, is not always quite above suspicion. When one brings before the public questions which have exercised the ability of professional theologians, might it not be expected that the public should be made aware that these questions are not now for the first time broached, that many critics of learning and skill have spent much labour on their solution, and that the answer now propounded or insinuated is not the only answer that can be or has been given? This, however, is by no means always attended to. An old difficulty is produced as if now for the first time discovered, and set forward as that which must quite alter the old ways of think-

ing, and shake us out of our established beliefs ; whereas it has been considered all along, and either satisfactorily answered among scientific theologians, or else reserved for possible solution, when the branch of inquiry which might throw light upon it has been more fully pursued. And in no work, more than in that of M. Renan, is the labour of earnest and skilful critics ignored. Theories which have been abandoned are here used as established, and statements hazarded which no one can be asked to accept who understands what has been *proved* about the Gospels. If this ignorance be real, then it is culpable in one who undertakes with a very unseemly confidence to instruct an erring Christendom ; if assumed, then it is nothing short of the most unworthy insolence towards those who have laboured in the same field as himself.

The Christ whom M. Renan depicts, is not the perfect man of Hase, still less the perfect revelation of God that Ewald delights to invest with whatsoever things are pure and lovely, but a good-hearted Galilean peasant, who gradually degenerates into an impostor and gloomy revolutionist. The ' Rabbi délicieux ' becomes, by some unaccountable transformation of character, a morbid, disappointed fanatic, when M. Renan but waves over him his magic wand. The miracles performed by him have been enormously exaggerated, and cures which a physician of our advanced age could very simply have accomplished were then looked upon as divine works. At first, Jesus was unwilling to appear as a thaumaturge ; but he found that there was but the alternative, either to satisfy the foolish expectations of the people, or to renounce his mission. He therefore prudently and honourably (M. Renan thinks) yielded to his friends, and entered on a course of mild and beneficent deception. It apparently forms no part of the author's plan to show how this picture is reconcilable with the statements of the Gospels.

The references to the narratives of the Evangelists, which are to be found on almost every page, are quite useless, being often detached from their immediate connection, and frequently grossly misapplied. So that his able reviewer, M. de Pressensé, has good cause to say : ‘A chaque pas on a des preuves nouvelles de l’aisance incroyable avec laquelle M. Renan traite les documents et de l’absence de toute méthode rigoureuse dans son livre’ (*L’Ecole Critique*, p. 20). His occasional references to other and more recondite sources, and his comparison of our Lord to Cakya-Mouni, may be intended to show how impossible it is for plain people to form a correct estimate of one who lived so long ago, and under such foreign influences, and to beget the feeling that there may have been hid, among the centuries and millions of the Eastern World, reformers as zealous and philosophers as divinely inspired as Jesus ; but we think it likely that most readers will find a truthfulness in the simple portrait of the Evangelists, which is not to be found in M. Renan’s erudite pages, and will refuse to abandon their belief in Him whom the Evangelists represent, even though they have not read the Vedas or the Talmud at first hand.

The work of M. Renan is open to three fatal objections. It has, first of all, no historical basis. He refuses to accept the only documents from which a Life of Jesus can be derived, or he has so used them as manifestly to annul their value as historical witnesses. If in one sentence he admits their truthfulness, in the next he contradicts them. The person whom he exhibits to his readers, is not the Jesus of the Gospels. He has first formed his idea of a character, and then has selected from the original sources whatever might seem to corroborate this idea, leaving altogether out of account, and without any reason assigned for the omission, whatever contradicts his idea. Now, to say nothing of the folly of so unscientific a treatment

of any historical documents, or of the utter worthlessness of whatever may be produced by such a method, every one sees that the arbitrary criticism of the author has laid him open to criticism of a like kind. If it is but a matter of private judgment what we are to receive from the Gospels, and what to reject, then why is M. Renan to become my teacher? *He* says, that in the relation of such and such an event or discourse, Luke is to be preferred; Ewald and Hase both come forward with denial, and assure us that, beyond all contradiction, John is to be preferred. To this, no reply is possible on the part of M. Renan. He has started without principle, and has no principle to fall back upon. He has arbitrarily judged the Evangelists, and arbitrarily must himself be judged.

Then, secondly, not only is the character which he depicts baseless so far as historical evidence goes, but it is inconsistent with itself, and therefore impossible. The author's method is bad, his result is worse. He has invented a historical character, and his invention does not even meet the requirements of poetry. He has been much praised as an artist; but he lacks the highest quality of an artist, truthfulness of conception. With unusual power of representation, with a cultivated faculty for reproducing past events and transporting his readers to scenes far distant, he fails in comprehension. His work is fragmentary, not a whole. Several of its parts lack nothing in artistic beauty and power; but when we endeavour to put them together, we find that they have no affinity. All that this writer lacked in order to produce a work of incalculable influence and profit to the world, was the fellowship with his subject which would have given him the meaning and place of each event in the life, by enabling him to conceive the purpose and spirit of the whole. But starting with his own low conception, he has been forced to interpret certain

acts of our Lord by causes wholly insufficient, and to exhibit a growth of character and progress of incident which a second-rate novelist would be ashamed of. He has represented the most pious of men as a deceiver, the most simple as ambitious, the most narrow and prejudice-fettered as the enlightener of all nations. No real character combines such contradictions; no dramatist who values his reputation represents his characters as passing through any such unnatural transitions. M. Renan's book is one more proof, that we must either raise Jesus much above the level of a mere pious, pure man, or sink Him much below it.

Then, thirdly, this person depicted by M. Renan is unfit to serve the required purpose. This '*Vie de Jésus*' is the first book of a proposed '*Histoire des Origines du Christianisme*.' And it must occur to most readers that this figure is quite an inadequate origin of Christianity. Granting that the portrait here given us were historically correct, that the conception were consistent and truthful, yet the person represented is not that person who stands at the birth of Christianity. This is not He to whom all the ages have been looking back, and whose image all Christians have borne in their hearts. This is not the morning star. Does M. Renan answer, that it is a mistake to which we have been looking back? Still it is this mistake which has made us Christians, and not the Christ of M. Renan. We descend with him to his own level, and altogether deny that the person exhibited in his volume is he who has caused and maintained our religion. What claim has this Galilean peasant on us? What has he done for us, that for his sake we should endure all hardness, taking up our cross daily and following him? He has lived well, he has spoken well; but with how many besides must he share our respect? Is it because this man has lived, that through all these centuries men have humbled

themselves? Is it this man they have been clothing, in clothing the naked—this man whom they have seen represented in all that needs consolation, sympathy, and help? Is it the remembrance of this man that has made life a ministry, and death a triumph? This man makes no claim on us—does not know us, and we will not own him. This person is not he who has called forth the trust of a world; this work is not that on which sinners, in the hour of their clearest vision of God, have rejoiced to rest; this character is not that which has moulded all that has been best on our earth, and all that has shone bright in its darkest places. If this be the founder of Christianity, then we must look for Christians among the sceptical and the Deists, among the careless and profane; and we must call that better religion which men (at their own instance, forsooth) have developed, and which has been the real belief and hope of Christendom, by some other name. If this be the founder of Christianity, and if Christianity be the right belief, then all religion must cease from the earth; for not only is this character unfit to sustain Christianity, but it is unfit to sustain any religion; it wants the *bond*.

Before passing from this brief account of the very interesting literature of the Life of our Lord, there should be mentioned two works, which, though they do not undertake a consideration of the whole subject, are yet so eminently serviceable in their special departments as to deserve careful study. One of these is the work of Lichtenstein on the Chronology of the Gospel Narrative (*Lebensgeschichte des Herrn Jesu Christi in chronologischer Uebersicht*. Erlangen, 1856). This author has the great advantage of writing after Wieseler; and, as the complement and corrective of the investigations of that very sagacious chronologist, his work does admirable service. With a mind well adapted for such research, scholarly, well-balanced, impartial, and clear, he has provided what is

perhaps, on the whole, the safest chronological guide through the perplexing intricacies of this history. The other work is *The Life of our Lord upon the Earth, in its Historical, Chronological, and Geographical relations*, by the Rev. Samuel J. Andrews. (Lond. 1863.) In this unassuming volume the various opinions of the best authorities are brought together, sifted, arranged, compared, and weighed; while the author's own opinion, though never asserted with arrogance or parade, is always worthy of consideration. Indeed, this work is indispensable to any one who intends a thorough study of the subject, but yet has not access to the authorities themselves, or has not leisure to use them. And so extensive is the literature of the mere external aspects of this Life, that it will still be but a few who can dispense with such a handbook as this. The accuracy of his references, and impartiality of his citations, as well as the fairness and candour of his own judgments, inspire us with confidence in the author.

Such being, so far as we know, a fair statement of what has transpired since the original publication of the work of Dr Lange, and which might be thought to diminish its value, it is obvious that this work has neither been superseded nor found a rival. And, regarding these volumes herewith issued, it is not too much courtesy to ask from the reader that he judge considerately a work which enters into all the difficulties of so wide and delicate a subject, and which emerges as this does from the turmoil of German opinion. There are but few occasions on which even this consideration will be required, and we believe that every candid reader will instinctively and spontaneously give it. For the genius of the author and the unmistakable direction of his theology, his love of truth and openness to conviction, disarm criticism, and turn assailants into apologists, if not into partisans. The author was himself well aware of the

difficult nature of the task he had undertaken, and at the appearance of the second volume of his work he made a statement which it is proper should be before the reader:—‘The author has had to enter into difficulties which have been left more or less unsolved in theological discussions. The result of his labours on these subjects he commits with confidence to the liberal and evangelical theologians of the present and the future. They who, confusing the general Church point of view with their own respective assumptions, formed as they are within the Church, meet with aught that seems strange to them in the discussion of single points, will find it a reasonable request, that they would, before passing a decided judgment, not only carefully weigh the reasons given by the author, but also compare his view with the views prevailing among Church theologians on the points in question. How very easily erroneous judgments may be precipitately formed, has often been proved. Before the bar of truth such judgments would be unimportant; but though I do not, for this reason, fear them on my own account, I would yet, as far as possible, prevent others forming them, from an apprehension of the curse resting upon all error. This cannot, however, apply to those whom a gloomy fanaticism induces to be always hunting for suspicious passages. They will find much which may lie open to the attacks of their uncalled-for decisions.’

There are some branches of Theology which, as the cautious Nitzsch says, ‘are yet young and tender’—some questions on which the Church has not pronounced; and on these the author will not be found to hold invariably the same views which are currently received in this country. There is, *e. g.*, the old question, whether Christ would have come in the flesh, if Adam had not sinned; whether Christ is necessary for the perfection as well as for the redemption of humanity. This is a question

which, so far as the voice of the Church goes, may be answered either affirmatively or negatively. It is a question which must be answered not so much by direct statements of Scripture, as by its connection with other and already answered questions. It would probably have been answered in the negative by the majority of our own theologians, and by the systematic divines of the seventeenth century. But the vast majority of German theologians have declared for the affirmative; Müller and Thomasius being almost solitary exceptions. It may be significant, that the theologians who have habitually treated the doctrines of grace, and from them reasoned to the person of Christ, have maintained the negative to this question; while those who have made the person of Christ their first and main study, and only from it inferred the other doctrines, have adopted the affirmative. However, it will not be thought surprising that, in the following volumes, considerable use should be made of the position, that apart from sin and the purpose of redemption, Christ would have come in the flesh—that the incarnation was required not only for the restoration but for the completion of humanity. This is not the place to urge what may be said on one side or other of the question, nor even to decide whether the question do not lie in a province altogether beyond Theology, and into which only incautious and immoderate speculation intrudes. This is not the place to show how the affirmative answer admits of a somewhat attractive application to some of the cardinal doctrines of our faith, and how many probabilities range themselves in its support; nor, on the other hand, to show that it seems to bring the nature of God unduly near to that of man (thus bordering dangerously on Pantheism), and to make light of that separation between the divine and human which has been brought about by sin. But it seems necessary, in one word, to warn the inexperienced reader, that if the incarnation

of Christ were from the first and by the very idea of humanity required, then the humiliation of Christ becomes a different and less grievous humiliation than we are wont to consider it, and the aspect of Christ's life upon earth in many points altered.

But besides these questions, about which there may be private opinions, and which must be decided rather by the general tone of Scripture than by its express statements, rather by their results and bearings upon other doctrines than by their own contents, there are dogmas which it is quite easy to state abstractly, but most difficult to apply to actual cases. It is one thing to state dogmatically the constitution of Christ's person, another to carry this dogma through the life of Christ, and exhibit the two natures in harmonious exercise. It is one thing to state that the two natures ever concur to the same resulting act, another to single out one particular act and exhibit this concurrence. Now this seems to be the great problem which those have to face who undertake a rigorous treatment of the Gospel history. It has been too much the custom of writers on the life of Christ to satisfy themselves with an occasional statement of the doctrine of His divinity, without attempting to keep the reader face to face with this doctrine throughout the whole history. In Germany the difficulty of exhibiting the perfect divinity of Christ throughout His earthly life has been so strongly felt, that their writers on Christology have revived an old and detrimental heresy, which delivers us from the necessity of attempting to exhibit full and perfect divinity in this period of our Lord's existence. It is believed by many of their theologians¹ that the Logos, in becoming incarnate, divested Himself of some of His attributes—that the 'emptying' Himself of which we read in the

¹ We are surprised to find that Alford (on Heb. i. 4) gives the weight of his name to a doctrine which, to say the least of it, seems plainly enough condemned by the Athanasian Creed.

Apostle Paul, means a self-exinanition whereby the divinity became as it were asleep in the person of Christ, or absent, or voluntarily incompetent for divine action,—whereby at least He really emptied Himself of the fulness of divine power. This doctrine is but the inevitable result of keeping in the background the divinity of Christ's person. If the divinity be but the necessary substratum of His person, be an inoperative constituent of His person, then the actual presence of real, complete, active divinity becomes awkward and undesirable. But if the person of our Lord be really and indissolubly of two natures; if in each moment of His earthly life there is present the divine as well as the human nature; if in each act or word of His the divine and human natures are concurrent,—then it must be the task of one who undertakes a life of this person to exhibit the two natures, and not either in separation from the other. Doubtless there is a skill in the Evangelists which no uninspired pen will ever rival, and by which we are made to feel the presence of the divine nature throughout the human life; yet surely it is our duty to endeavour, in our expositions and developments of these inspired records, to maintain the impression which their immediate perusal produces. If they often bring out to view the divinity of our Lord, where also the very feebleness of humanity is conspicuous; if, when they show us a weary and footsore wanderer seated by the well in the heat of the day, they make us feel a reverential awe for that weakness, inasmuch as it is the humiliation of a divine person; if, when they show us the man hanging on the cross, faint for thirst, they show us also the divine power to speak forgiveness with His latest breath to the dying sinner by His side; if, when we see human weakness at its depth sinking in death, we hear also the divine proclamation of a willing sacrifice, the 'It is finished' of one whose life no man can take away;—then a life of Christ is just in so far im-

perfect as it effaces from our minds this distinct impression of divinity and humanity acting in the one person.

Now it need not be denied, that in these volumes there is room for improvement in respect of this leading problem. The author holds most distinctly and decidedly the doctrine of our Lord's divinity,—of His personal pre-existence as God the Son. If this doctrine is not always in view where we might expect it, then this is not by any means because the author would thus insinuate that the person contemplated is merely human. There is not the smallest ground for suspicion of this; we almost feel that it is doing him a wrong to make this statement. Yet we are not quite sure that all readers will take up that idea of the Person which the author would desire. We think that he has sometimes ascribed to the humanity what can only be ascribed to divinity. We think that there is visible throughout the work an undue desire to attribute as much as possible to the human faculty of our Lord. Now, of course, it is not at all easy to say what is and what is not competent to human nature. We do not know, except by its exhibition in Christ, what that nature is capable of. It has only once been seen in perfect development and exercise, and that is in the case in question. So that it is often difficult to make any valid objection to one who asserts of this or that action in the life of our Lord, that it is simply human. It may be an action which demanded far more than ordinary human faculty, and yet may possibly be within the range of perfect human faculty. It is impossible to produce from human history any similar exercise of power or wisdom; and yet this being the culminating point of human history, we expect here to find unrivalled human action. In short, we are to beware of confounding perfect humanity with divinity, and, in the life of Christ, of ascribing to His divine power what ought to be attributed to His perfect human

nature. But there is no necessity that we should pronounce upon every action whether it be competent to human nature or no. We are not to expect to go through the life of Christ, saying, This His humanity does, and this again His divinity. Both human and divine acts are competent to this person; and though now it is a human and again a divine act which He does, though now He forgives sin and again sleeps through weariness, His humanity and divinity are alike and together engaged in each. But sometimes it is apparent, that such and such an act of His is divine, and there we can say, This person is not merely human; and sometimes it is apparent that the action is human, and there we can say, This person is not merely divine.

So that there are two positions which must regulate our conception of any single action of this life. First, Every act in the life of Christ is a divine as well as a human act. The divine nature of Christ is not only present, as a spectator or sleeping partner of the human, but is energetic in every act. Especially is this true of some of those actions which are most conspicuously, and to some beholders exclusively, human. It is true of His dying. This is an act, it is shortly said, which God cannot perform. But what was this dying? It was the separation of the human body and soul of our Lord. And this God the Son did perform. He offered Himself through the Spirit. The divine nature did not die; but the dying here in question was the act of a divine person, was an act by, in, and on a divine person. If not, then this dying was little to us. If there was here a retirement of divinity that this human act might be performed; if there was a self-depotentiation of the Logos that men might work their will with the humanity, then this was not the sacrifice sufficient for our atonement. We must lay aside our natural expectation, that wherever God is, the utterance of His presence will be loud, His glory manifest, His

acts appalling and stupendous. We must learn to see God stooping to lift the little children, veiling His glory in the compassionate and wistful look of a brother, that the diseased might come to the touch of His hand, and the sinner listen to His word of forgiveness; leaving the place of His glory empty, that He might follow and recover the abandoned; becoming flesh, that He might taste death for every man. On the one hand, the humanity of Christ must not be regarded as impersonal, as a thing used by God, as a collection of passive, unwilling faculties, but as fully equipped humanity,—not indeed existing as a person outside of the Divinity, but neither interrupted by the Divinity in the free exercise of any human faculty, nor prevented in any human weakness. And, on the other hand, the Divinity must be regarded as complete and perfect Divinity, not divested of any divine power by its union with the human nature, not at the incarnation laying aside nor emptying itself of any of those divine attributes which it was the very purpose of the incarnation to manifest and glorify, not in respect of any divine attribute ‘ceasing to be what He previously was’ by becoming what He previously was not.

The second position is this: every divine operation in the life of Christ was immediately the operation of the Spirit. This is a simple corollary from the established theological truth, that every operation of God on things external is through the Spirit. Whatever, then, the Divinity of Christ performed after His human birth, was the result of the sending forth of the Spirit from the Son dwelling in the person of our Lord. There is not merely an influence of the Holy Ghost on Jesus, a mere man, so that the miracles are performed in no sense by the divine nature in Christ, but by powers conferred from without. There is the Holy Ghost in His fulness residing *in this Person*, so that without this Person there proceeds no power from

Divinity to any created thing. And it is just this which distinguishes the miracles of Christ from the miracles of a mere man ; the latter being performed by virtue of a divine power which only for the time is communicated to the person, the former being the forth-putting of a power of which this Person is the proper residence. And yet the miracles are given to Him by the Father to do, and are in a sense ‘not His own works.’ For as in His whole mission the Son is the Sent of the Father fulfilling His will, so the works which He does are the Father’s works. And this both because He Himself is the Father’s commissioner on earth, and because without the Father the Spirit, by whose working this commission is discharged, is not given. So that the distinctive agency by which the miracles of our Lord were wrought was the incarnate Person dwelling in union with the Father, and possessing the fulness of the Spirit ; was not the Divinity of Christ without the Spirit, but was not the Spirit without the Divinity.

We are therefore under no necessity to inquire (as the author unduly does) whether or no the miracles may not be brought a little nearer human nature. They are no doubt performed *through* the human nature, but so is every divine act in the life of our Lord. We see the human nature active in all its faculties throughout the miracle ; but we are not on that account to suppose that the miracle is explicable on human principles and laws, for *all* the divine acts of Christ are human acts also,—the acts of a Person in whom the Spirit of God is harmoniously co-operating with and possessing every human faculty. That we see ordinary and human means made use of in some of the miracles ; that we see inquiry as to the nature of the disease, and delay in its cure ; that we see many traces of human procedure ; that we see *humanity doing its utmost* in these miracles ;—all this is assuredly no reason for our seeking to ascribe to the human

nature more than the most ascertained science would warrant, because in the whole life of Christ we are prepared to see the highest manifestations of Divinity in juxtaposition with ordinary human action. To say that, in this case or that, the divine nature of our Lord is not manifestly exercised in distinction from the human, is only to say that here you have an instance of what must be everywhere expected in His life. And when a demand is made or a longing betrayed, that in the miracles the divine nature be exhibited without the intervention of the Spirit; or when, as a result or accompaniment of this, there is manifested a tendency to ascribe as much as possible to the human nature influenced by the Spirit, without the ascription of this very influence of the Spirit to the divine nature resident in Christ,—then there is not only a misconception of miracle, but a misconception of the Person of our Lord.

It has been thought better to make these general statements by way of preface, than to adopt the somewhat invidious expedient of interrupting the course of the author's argument by interjectional comments. On the one hand, we have considered it unjust to an author to use for the refutation of his views the very pages which were intended to advance them; and, on the other hand, we have presumed that it would not be very interesting to the public to be informed of every instance in which the private opinion of the editor might differ from that of the author. This applies especially to the section on Miracles. No attempt has been made to put the reader in possession of a theory of miracles which might be thought more adequately to satisfy the requirements of the Gospel narratives. This would evidently have required a much larger space, and much stronger claims on the attention of the reader, than our connection with this work would allow us to assume. Where, however, any point seemed to admit of being treated in the narrow limits of a foot-

note, we have used some liberty with the author, always in a respectful spirit, though not always finding room for the forms of polite deference; and where an opinion opposed to the author's seems to have been treated with less consideration than it merits, either intrinsically or by reason of the consideration due to its advocates, we have not scrupled to produce and support such opinion. But throughout we have felt this business of annotating a delicate one, and have not altogether regretted that the time allotted for the task prevented a more frequent and substantial interference with the writings of one whose statements it is almost equally difficult to supplement and unsafe to contradict. Care has been taken to render the work as available as possible to the English reader. In the case of those books referred to by the author, which have been translated into our own language, the references have been made to the translations. Where the works have not been translated, the German titles have been left as in the original, for distinction's sake. A full and carefully compiled index will be given in the last volume.

We sincerely wish that some abler, steadier hand could have been employed to launch these volumes, for now more than ever do we understand the grandeur of their subject and the paramount importance of its accurate apprehension; but we trust that those who most distinctly and painfully see the defects of our share in the work, will not the less earnestly desire and pray that it may diffuse juster conceptions of the Person and work of our Redeemer, and may beget an interest in His earthly life which may be the beginning of eternal fellowship with Him in the life everlasting; that those even who come but to touch the hem of His garment, to observe His movements, to speculate on His miracles, to consider the development of His character, to retire for a little from the glare and hurry of our day into the

fresh and calm morning when the world awoke at the touch of its Lord,—that even these may be drawn to follow Him, and may pass from the first confession of Peter, ‘Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,’ to the last, ‘Lord, Thou knowest all all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee.’

THE EDITOR.

EDINBURGH, *March* 1864.



P R E F A C E.



HAVE for many years cherished a secret inclination to attempt a delineation of the life of Jesus. It is to my present official situation, however, that I am indebted for leisure and opportunity to realize this idea.

I think it necessary to state this, for the sake of preventing erroneous constructions, and especially such as might attribute the polemics of my work rather to my external relations, than to my internal convictions.

The fact that multitudinous works on the life of Jesus have followed each other in a succession which at present seems endless, has not availed to turn me from my purpose. The conviction that I also, am called upon to promote the knowledge of this great subject, is accompanied by a good conscience, and forbids all false and conventional apologies, and only allows me to offer them for my defective fulfilment of a work entrusted to me. It seems to me, moreover, that there can be no reason for any uneasiness at the appearance of so many works on the life of Jesus. The fact that, even by professional and official theologians, direct and repeated insult has of late been done to the Gospel history, the pride and boast of Christendom, and that the attempt has even been made to form this insulting theology into a distinct school which shall institute a new treatment of the Gospels, has evoked this phenomenon. The various 'Lives of Jesus' of the better sort form a new theological consecration, which we may hope is not yet concluded. The old custom,

however, of connecting a consecration with a fair, applies in this case also ; and we must reconcile ourselves to the connection of this consecration with the motley fair of a mass of works on the life of Jesus, furnished in answer to external motives.

The plan which is to guide the work begun in this volume bears reference to the foundation, the peculiar characteristics, and the development of the evangelical history, and hence to its root, its stem, and its branches.

With respect to the foundation of the Gospel history, the attempt has been made, in the present Book, to furnish a clear representation of two of its essential relations : its relation, on the one hand, to the ideal and its multiform phenomena, and on the other, to criticism.

In the second Book follows a continuous and synoptic exhibition of the life of Jesus. In this I hope to give distinct prominence to the chief particulars of the articulation by which the four Gospels are united into one actual history.

In the third and last Book, I propose to sketch the life of Jesus in its broader features, according to that development of its infinite richness which is presented by the peculiar views of each separate Gospel.

In this work, the assumption (which is still too widely prevalent) that the essential Gospel history is injured, and has become a spoilt joint history, will be emphatically opposed. The prejudice, that the four accounts are the source of a want of unity, will be met by the proof that they rather exhibit the richness of this unity. If the Lord give me health and strength, the execution of the work shall not be delayed.

The relation of the Gospel history to that criticism which is antagonistic to it, is already happily and ecclesiastically decided. It is, however, the task of Theology to explain the same scientifically ; and the author will feel happy if he shall in any wise have contributed to its accomplishment. It may here, however, be once for all remarked, that too sharp a distinction cannot be made between criticism in a Christian sense, and the Antichris-

tian nuisance which now assumes that name. Christianity is, in its absolute trustworthiness and infinite depth of spiritual light and vigour, identical with true criticism. Never let us attribute to a sincere and candid testing of the Gospels, and of Holy Scripture in general, the evils appertaining to criticism falsely so called. Even the most certain facts of faith are not, in the fullest sense, our own possession, till the sharpest, most vigilant, and most practised spiritual intellect has freely admitted and appropriated them. If man is to be fully blessed, his understanding, no less than his other powers, must be fully satisfied.

This pure interest has, in any case, less to do with those highly partial dialectics which would now obtrude upon it as ‘Criticism,’ than William Tell with John the Parricide. For it is the interest of ‘Criticism’ of this kind always to sever the ideal as widely as possible from the real. Hence arose the canon, that if any narrative of the Gospels shows a gleam of ideality, or betrays any symbolical light, its historical nature is doubtful. This monstrous error, followed out to its results, denies Christianity itself. For what is Christianity but the announcement of the Incarnate Word, and the glorification of the historical Christ in the light of the Spirit? This error, however, in its milder forms, has been widely propagated. It has beguiled even pious and sincere critics, such as Schleiermacher and others. When Schleiermacher, *e.g.*, remarks (on the writings of Luke, p. 47), in contesting the historical character of the narrative of the visit of the magi, ‘Has it not, in its deepest foundations, a character wholly symbolical?’ etc.—his remark is quite in accordance with this canon. It is the very thing we demand of the primitive facts of Christianity, that they should have a wholly symbolical character, that the universe should be mirrored in them, and that not only in their deepest foundations, as if this crystal were still obscured by its crust of dull ore. Thus Von Ammon too, lays down the rule (*die Gesch. des Lebens Jesu*, vol. i. 4): ‘Though even history only attains connection and keeping through the ideal and tendency of the

world, yet the too intimate union of the ideal and the real, of the natural and supernatural, is prejudicial to the actuality of events.' Certainly, it may be answered, the old commonplace reality may, and even *must*, be prejudiced by the (but not too) intimate union of the ideal and the real, it must at last perish; but this is in order that this ordinary reality, this reality invaded by the illusions of unreality, may not for ever prejudice the ideal in the realization of the true reality. Weisse, in his *Evang. Gesch.*, repeatedly returns to the above-mentioned proposition. 'The historical revelation of God in the Gospel (it is said, vol. i. p. 231) loses nothing of its holy contents, if a part of these contents, instead of being viewed as direct fact of a kind in which Divinity exhibits itself more in jest than in earnest, and carrying on, so to speak, a paradoxical, half poetic, half prosaic jest with its own sublimest work, is rather recognised as the genial and intellectual work, in which the group of men to whom the divine revelation of Christianity was first addressed, preserved a productive creative consciousness of that Divine Spirit which descended among them, and of the mode of His agency. It is such a consciousness which has found its thoroughly fitting expression in the sacred legend.' Here, then, the productive creative consciousness of a group of men is to surpass the productivity of the Spirit which descended among them, so that the revelation of the Logos is again overgrown by a new mythology. If Weisse had duly estimated 'the paradoxical, half poetic, half prosaic game' of Divinity in the Gospel history as the manifestation of God,—a manifestation, on one side wholly ideal, on the other wholly actual, and therefore specifically Christian,—his writings would not have furnished so many germs, which, growing in rank luxuriance in the works of Bruno Bauer, have shot up under the assumption, consistently developed by the latter, that the creative consciousness of the group of men to whom the revelation was at first addressed produced the whole work of the Gospels. In Strauss and Bruno Bauer this severance between the ideal and reality, so far as the latter is to

be described in its full force as individual reality, appears in the form of a well-defined principle.

Strauss will not allow that the ideal was in Christ also the historical (vol. ii. p. 690), though the divine consciousness is said to have been in absolute force in Him (p. 689). It cannot, indeed, be understood how the absolute force of divine consciousness should remain behind the representation of the ideally historical, unless it had to contend with the inflexible material of an obscure primitive substance, in which case the 'absolute' force is mere word. At length Bruno Bauer found the matter of reality so obstinate, that he found it most convenient to view the Gospel history as originating in the vacant space of the fixed idea of the Evangelists, instead of suffering it to struggle in that swamp of Ahriman, which reality seemed to him to form. 'The author,' says he in his *Kritik der Evang. Gesch.*, etc., vol. i. p. 57, speaking of the presentation of Jesus in the temple—'yes, the author has been at work here. Reality does not manage matters as easily as he does. Reality does not present the appearance of being a work of art, in which, whether in a picture or on the stage, all that is forcible is artistically arranged, so as to suit the spectators and its own component parts; it interposes a dull and scarcely penetrable mass—it interposes years and conflicts with the refractory material of the intellectual public, between its heroes and those with whom they stand in historical connection,' etc. 'Criticism,' it is said, p. 59, 'is constrained to point out the true historical reality of the ideal, in opposition to the nullity of the supposed facts.' Thus, however, the reality of the ideal remains, though contrasted in a shadowy manner to the nullity of the facts. Criticism, however, is progressive; for in vol. iii. p. 311, it is said, 'If we so view the Gospels as to overlook their mutual contradictions, *i.e.*, if we abstract from their confused contents a general image, as simple, unprejudiced faith is wont to do, we shall be in the highest degree amazed, that they could have possibly occupied mankind for the space of eighteen centuries, and indeed have so occupied them, that their secret was

not discovered. For in not one, not even in the shortest paragraph, are there wanting views which injure, insult, and irritate mankind.' Here, then, even the ideals which the Gospels contain are condemned as culprits.

But the same author informs us, vol. i. p. 82, how the Gospels must have originated. He leads us into the factory of an Evangelist, in which the religious self-consciousness is occupied with the work of creative self-development in the production of a Gospel. How then is this work going on? 'As religious self-consciousness, it is entirely possessed by its own matter: it cannot live without it, nor without continually producing and stating it; for it possesses therein the experience of its own certainty. But as religious consciousness, it views itself, at the same time, as entirely distinct from its essential matter, and so soon as it has developed, and at the same moment that it develops and exhibits it, this matter becomes to it, reality existing independently, above and beyond itself, as the absolute and its history.' That this is said with reference not to the gradual productivity of the Church, but to the literary labour of the Evangelist, is proved by the whole context, and especially by the following remark: 'Belief in these productions is further secured by the fact, that the incentive to their composition, and the first material used therein, was furnished from without, and even by the belief of the whole Church.'

If the above psychological portraits of certain religious authors were laid before a medical college of our days for their opinion, and the precaution used of naming neither the originals nor the artist, they could scarcely pass any other judgment than that these authors were deranged.

The author had already thus depicted the Evangelists, before the decision of the Evangelical Theological Faculty of Prussia had appointed him to his theological office.

The critical tendency here pointed out proceeds then, from a philosophical principle opposed to the perfect union of the

actual and the ideal. This tendency has already settled down into the constant practice of suspecting a Gospel fact to be unhistorical, if similar facts occur in the Old Testament. Neither, in this respect, has it been thought sufficient to compare together mere accessory incidents of the Old and New Testaments. When, *e.g.*, in the one, Moses, coming down from the mount, finds the people in the midst of wild amusements, and in the other, Christ, descending from the mount of transfiguration, finds a helpless multitude, perplexed disciples, and in the midst of the sad group the demoniac boy and his afflicted father, this is said to be a similarity which makes the New Testament narrative suspicious. (Bauer, vol. iii. 59.) 'Moses, indeed, when he ascended the mountain, left Aaron and Hur and the seventy elders below, that whoever had any matter might apply to them. So also were the disciples left at the bottom, while the Lord was on the mount, and so was a matter actually brought before them.' It is well known, too, how the later books of the Old and New Testament, and similarly related phenomena, have been placed in battle array against each other. Such a mode of procedure must, however, be protested against for the sake of the ideal itself. If in proportion as history becomes rich in significance, refers in its accounts of great persons to still greater, alludes in its statements of extraordinary events to the most extraordinary, and, being more and more penetrated by the eternal light, points with increasing plainness to the rising of an eternal sun of reconciliation between the ideal and the actual, it is to be viewed with suspicion, this amounts, however unconscious the organs of such criticism may be of the fact, to a progressive theoretic brutalization of reality;—a process at first confined to its memorials, but, after their destruction, extended to its very self. (See Apokal. xiii.)

We now pass from the theoretic to the ethical motives of this criticism. It is evident that many of the assumptions lately made in criticising the Gospels, and the Scriptures in general, can only be explained on the supposition, that those who

hold them must occupy a doubtful position with relation to the moral sublimity of primitive Christianity and its instruments. If any one were to assert that Schiller, in his *Wilhelm Tell*, intended to depreciate the Germans in comparison with the Swiss, that Göthe, in his *Faust*, intended to undervalue German students and citizens, every one would zealously protest against points of view so very subordinate and insufficient. If, moreover, an acute observer were to maintain that he could still perceive in the glowing ruby traces of its material basis, the clay, and that in its ruddy hue he still saw the remains of the red soil, or that in the sparkling diamond he could recognise its primitive parent, the common black charcoal, so acute a natural philosopher would be dismissed with a smile. The canon would be acted on, that in the matured phenomena of a higher grade of existence, the agents of the decidedly surpassed grade can no more appear as factors, or in unbroken masses and forms. It is according to this rule also, that we must judge those critical representations which suppose they have discovered in the fourth Gospel, now a neglect of Peter in comparison with John, now an over-estimation of Andrew; or in the third, a miserable tendency to a compromise between Pauline and Ebionitic Christianity; or in the Acts, an effort to exalt Paul by the juxtaposition of his history with that of Peter. Did not the disputes of the disciples for precedence end with Good Friday? Can we doubt their maintenance of their new point of view, when they could so freely confess their old one to the world, and speak of it as the sinful folly of a former time? Could they have again so pitiously sunk from the sublime height of suffering and triumphing with Christ? Is it not rather this over-refined criticism, which insists on seeing the red clay in the ruby, which must be designated as deeply degenerated—as fallen from the heights of Christian theology, which believes in the article of the Holy Ghost in the Church, to the point of view of ‘*Kabale und Liebe*,’ to a condition in which it discovers even in the Gospels the well-known fruits of literary intrigue, because

it seeks everywhere only its own flesh and blood? Hence arises the miserable assumption, which seems to have almost formed itself into a school, that primitive Christianity was radically an Ebionite, and therefore *a mutilated* Christianity; and that it was not till afterwards, that a pure catholic Christianity cast off this mutilating element.

It cannot be denied that Ebionite elements existed as *accidental, suppressed, restrained* principles in many members of the pentecostal Church. But if even the fundamental principles of this Church had been attacked by this Ebionitish night-mare, we should then obtain an image of a redeeming, world-moving fact, which had itself entered the world crippled and needing redemption. But primitive Christianity passes by such observations in its pure New Testament purity, and it is the task of true criticism to get rid of combinations which transform into moral caricatures the glorious forms of the Gospel narrative. It is in the nature of things that the methods of spurious criticism should correspond with its principles. We have said what seemed most necessary in this respect in the body of the work, and have also adduced proofs; while for the more detailed corroboration of our assertions we have referred to the best known works on this subject. As, however, it might seem to many but reasonable that more copious proofs should be adduced, we here cite some which are met with in the works of Strauss and Bruno Bauer, contrasting the actual facts with the treatment they have experienced at the hands of the above-named writers.

Papias, one of the Fathers, expresses himself in the following manner concerning a Gospel of Matthew: 'Matthew wrote *λόγια* (a Gospel writing) in the Hebrew language. And this every one explained (or translated) as best he could.' Thus Papias refers (1) to a Hebrew Gospel of Matthew; (2) to efforts at explanation, or translation of the same, of varying value. This fact is thus treated by Strauss: 'The Fathers, indeed, referred this testimony expressly to our first Gospel; but there is not only *no* (it should have been *no decided*) reference thereto

in the words of the apostolic Father, but the apostolical writing of which he speaks, cannot be directly (this directly is needless) identical with it, because, according to the evidence of Papias, Matthew wrote *ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ*, while the fact that our Greek Gospel of Matthew is a translation of the original Hebrew, is *merely* assumed (it ought to have been added, *in agreement with the evidence of Papias*) by the Fathers.'

The same Papias says of St Mark, that, as companion and interpreter to Peter, he received his Gospel orally from that apostle, and afterwards committed it to writing. The above-named critic says, 'Our second Gospel *cannot* have been derived from remembrances of the tradition of Peter, and thus from an original source peculiarly its own, *because* it is evidently *compounded* from the first and third, even if only from recollections of these. Here we have, (1) the much disputed hypothesis, that St Mark's Gospel was derived from St Matthew's and St Luke's, laid down as an established fact; (2) it is represented as an impossibility that a man's *own* remembrances should take the same form in which others had expressed the same experiences. Two wonderful delusions!

Again, there is no evidence existing that Polycarp, the disciple of the Apostle John, knew the fourth Gospel, or described it as the work of that apostle. Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp (who, however, mentions St John as the author of the fourth Gospel), adduces no such evidence. An early statement of the critic is as follows: 'There is no evidence given by Polycarp, who is said to have known John, *not even in what remains of his writings* (viz., a single short epistle), that John was the author of this Gospel: even Irenæus, the disciple of Polycarp, cannot appeal to one sentence of his master in favour of its genuineness' (directly opposed to fact). In a later statement he says, 'It must excite surprise, that Irenæus, who already had to defend John's authorship of this Gospel against opponents, neither on this, nor any other occasion, etc., appeals in this matter to the most important authority of this apostolic man.' Would

then, this appeal to his own youthful reminiscences have been a public means of proof? His declaration at least leaves this reminiscence to be inferred. But what if Irenæus, in proof of his own declaration, had said: it is the case, for Polycarp once told me so?

Once more, Mary receives the message of the angel that, by the miraculous agency of God she shall become the mother of the Messiah, and 'is found with child of the Holy Ghost.' Joseph learns her condition, probably from herself, though we are not told so; he mistrusts her, and is about to put her away; but the information of an angel gives him the confidence he needed. The critic says, 'They who insist that Mary did not act in the manner which the Evangelists certainly do not assume (viz., concealing the secret from Joseph), must suppose her to have communicated the angelic message to her betrothed immediately after its reception, and that he gave no credence to her information, and will then have to find some way of clearing the character of Joseph.' What kind care for the character of Joseph! The critics would certainly have believed the most extraordinary event on the word of the pious Virgin. Joseph did not, which made him a character, and preserved him, by the bye, from the opposite reproof of the critic, that he was without a character. According, however, to the present requirements of the critic, Joseph ought, on the mere assurance of his betrothed, to have met the reproaches of the whole world, and said: The miracle is certain, for Mary herself tells me so!

Again, Christ did not, when dealing with the Jews, appeal to His miraculous origin. The fact is easy of explanation. This mystery is conceivable only by those who are initiated into the depths of the Christian faith, and is one which could not be announced to the profane, as being, more than any other, liable to profanation. Our critic says, 'All his contemporaries esteemed Him a son of Joseph (as indeed in a civil point of view He was), and not seldom (twice at least) was this contemptuously and reproachfully expressed in His presence, *and a decided oppor-*

tunity thus afforded Him of appealing to His miraculous conception.' That is to say, of declaring: This mystery is true, my mother Mary told me so. Certainly 'Criticism' would forthwith have believed Him.

According to the Gospel of St. Luke, a family relationship existed between Mary and the family of John the Baptist. It might consequently be presumed that John was acquainted with Jesus before the baptism of the latter. This seems, too, to have been actually the case, since, according to Matthew, the Baptist, on the appearance of Jesus, immediately uttered an exclamation expressive of the deepest reverence. According, however, to the fourth Evangelist, the Baptist said, with a retrospect to a time prior to that when the heavenly manifestation at Jesus' baptism had accredited Him as the Messiah: I knew Him not. The remarks of our critic are as follow: 'If John were personally acquainted with Jesus, in conformity with Luke's account of the relationship existing between them, it is impossible that he should not early enough have received the information, how solemnly Jesus had been announced as the Messiah, both before and after His birth; nor could he have subsequently said *that he knew nothing of it (I knew Him not!)* till he received a sign from heaven, but would have stated that he had not believed the account of the former signs, *one of which had actually occurred to himself*' (as he perhaps remembered, in his mother's womb). That is to say, that unless the Baptist wished to appear as an unbeliever, incredulous even concerning his earliest impressions, in his mother's womb, he would, in consequence of his youthful reminiscences, have announced with prophetic confidence and authority that Jesus was the Messiah; and if questioned concerning *his divine assurance and credentials*, have answered: *My mother Elisabeth told me so*. Thus would criticism have it, assuring us it would have given more credit than believers in the Bible could have done, to the assurances of the pious women in this great theocratic vital question, nay, that it would have inconsiderately believed them, and, with an entire

misconception of its office, have preached the mystery upon their authority. How sublime, on the contrary, is the conscientiousness of the Baptist when he says, I knew Him not! But after the striking sign from heaven he knows Him. In the kingdom of God affairs are conducted with more diplomatic exactness than most critics imagine.

One of the most pointed and sublime of the sayings of Jesus is that recorded by St Luke (ch. xiii. 33): 'I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following; for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem.' Every unprejudiced reader must at once feel and understand the greatness of this saying. The critic Bruno Bauer makes the remark, 'Where is the dogma written, that no prophet can perish out of Jerusalem, or what antecedents could lead Jesus to a dogma of this kind?'

If Christ demands of His hearers, at one time, that they should believe, at another, that they should watch and pray, or even that they should fast with anointed face, we are nevertheless convinced that His demands are everywhere identical, because prayer is the expression of faith, and fasting is to be grounded on the heartfelt devotion of faith. The same critic observes, concerning the narrative of Mark ix. 14-29, 'It is certainly a contradiction, when the Lord, in the same breath, requires faith, and fasting, and prayer, as the condition of one and the same work.'

According to Matt. xviii. 1-5, Jesus places a child in the midst of His disciples to reprove their ambition, and says the words: 'Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'—The critic says, 'In answer to the childish question of the disciples, Jesus takes a child—we should like to know where it came from, since, according to the original narrative, the transaction took place in the house in which Jesus and His disciples were resting after their journey; we should like also to have seen the perplexed face of the poor child, placed in the

midst of the disciples, to serve for a lecture to them—and after He had set it in the midst of His disciples—a piece of cake would have pleased it better,—He said, etc.’ ‘We should like to know where it came from!’ ‘A horse, a horse! my kingdom for a horse!’ As the fugitive despairing king cries out for a horse, so does the critic seem here to be crying out for a child to save the veracity of the Gospel history, which has been committed to his keeping. Or does not the matter rather stand thus: if in this place a child were anywhere to be had, if a child should but have stepped into the midst, the critic is annihilated.

We must indeed remark, that all the irregular mental activity which, under the name of criticism, has presented so strange and meteor-like an appearance in the province of New Testament theology, ‘has surpassed itself’ in misrepresentations, contemptuous jokes and blasphemies, in the third vol. of Bruno Bauer’s *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte*.

It were much to be wished that some young theologian, endowed with a sufficient amount of good humour, would bring out a harmony of the principal modern critics of the Gospels. If the great discrepancies of these writers were collected together, or arranged for contest with each other in only a moderately striking manner, a sad exhibition would be presented. It would be seen that here, as formerly in the camp of the Philistines (1 Sam. xiv. 20) ‘every man’s sword was against his fellow,’ and there would be ‘a very great discomfiture.’ The scene would, however, be followed by the conviction, that there is in this world nothing more uncertain than a certain ‘knowledge,’ viz., the knowledge of those knowing ones who, as a reviewer in Tholuck’s *Anzeiger* strikingly remarks, make their inferences with ‘arguments like blackberries.’ It may be hoped that times more propitious for the scientific development of the theological material of the Gospel history will very soon appear, when the produce of decidedly antagonistic criticism may be disposed of in very short archæological foot-notes. Meanwhile, the contest

must be carried on, on this field, in spite of the ill-will and disgust of him who wages it. It must not, however, be forgotten, that the first and more formidable leaders of antagonistic criticism have not concerned themselves with mere Gospel pictures alone, but also with the frames in which the older harmonistic theology had enclosed them. The steady, clear, and discerning eye of a connoisseur will not indeed let itself be prejudiced against the tranquil beauty of an old picture by the inappropriateness of its frame; but the frame may, by its contrast of tawdry finery and repulsive dirt, prejudice even against the picture one who bestows upon it a more hasty though candid inspection. Those critics who have misconceived the Gospel, must take it into account that anxiety with respect to the agreement of the evangelical records was already in the house before they so violently assaulted the door, and that the anxiety disappeared in proportion to the violence of their attack. The first unbelief was ecclesiastical official zeal, which forced the letter of the Gospels into harmony, because it had neglected, nay, almost forgotten, their internal unity.

The work which I have commenced shall, by God's help, take its part in the efforts now making to exhibit the internal unity of the Gospel history. The first part is sent forth with a lively feeling of its known and unknown defects. The book, however, certainly stands prepared to be 'annihilated' by one party, to be possibly ignored, or even unworthily treated, by another. They who, with the author, recognise the manifestation of eternal life in the centre of humanity, of the world, and of time, or who at least have not suffered the great and simple sense for this eternal life to be perplexed by the phantom-like contest of ancient and modern delusions in our days, will receive the work in a friendly spirit. May it, in ever so small a measure, contribute to those signs of spring which foretell an approaching vernal season to the Church!

THE AUTHOR.

FIRST BOOK.


THE INTRODUCTION.

PART I.

THE FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

SECTION I.

THE INCARNATION OF GOD.

 HERE is an eternal relation between God and man. From the human stand-point, which is also the stand-point of the spiritual life, we can form no conception of man without God, nor of God without man.

The attempt has indeed often been made to conceive of man without God. But it has always been found necessary to designate that infinite contrast to his nature, that mighty objective power on which he is dependent, by some name. And thus some sort of God has always been given him again—an obscure image of God, indeed, instead of the living God. Perhaps he has been made dependent upon fate, and thus upon a gloomy and inexorable God ; or upon nature, and thus upon a dreamy God, a God without freedom ; or upon humanity, and thus upon a God full of wants, exposed to danger, and without resources. In any case, it has always been found necessary to give to man another God while seeking to deprive him of his own. And even when unbelief has, as in modern times, advanced to the

borders of Atheism, and sought to make man the very ruler of himself and of the universe, it has yet found itself obliged to borrow, or rather to purloin from Faith, the word God. It has committed itself to a logical absurdity, and asserted, God is not God, but man is God; being well aware that the proposition, Man is man! would never be so understood as it must be, if man is to be his own God. A plunder of the disputed belief in God was committed, similar to that which is committed upon the belief in a future life, when this is denied, and the present life exalted. What is a present without a future life? The same as God in man, who is to be everything except God. It is, however, a fact deeply planted in the nature of man, that he cannot be conceived of without God. He loses his human significance so soon as he is viewed independently. He becomes a mythic being, animated at best by a demon, a fantastic monster. The nature of man certainly consists in this, that he is a child of the Spirit, and therefore spiritual; that he has a sense for the universal and the eternal, namely, reason; a stand-point beyond the universal and in presence of the eternal, freedom of will, and a capacity for finding and feeling himself in the universal and the eternal, and the eternal and the whole world in himself; the feeling of love. This capacity is not a mere capacity for the general in humanity. The eye of man hails the eternal Spirit even in Orion. It is not merely a sense for the universal; for in the universal is also ever apparent the variety of the finite, which extends itself by measure and number. The conception of *all* facilitates the comprehension of number; creation can scarcely be so generally and acutely conceived as when designated by the expression, the world. Reason is rather the capacity of clearly apprehending the eternal Spirit, in which the universal has its foundation from and to eternity, the Spirit which creates and sustains the universal, in a word, God. What is man without God? If his spirit embraces only the sphere of earth, and not also the heaven; if it does not penetrate the heavens, and ascend to that eternal Being in whom time and space are one, or rather in whom they are nothing; if it does not this, what is it but a mere local instinct, like the perceptive powers of brutes? What is man's righteousness if it is only the revelation of a law which merely holds men together, and if it is not an entrance into that rule of life which pervades

all heights and all depths, and is absolutely universal? It is then a civil service, but not a spiritual virtue. And is not the love of man deprived of the greatest part of its glory when he is deprived of his God? Why is a beautiful countenance so mighty to awaken natural love? Because by his countenance man reveals his personality, and in his personality proclaims the Eternal. And why does spiritual love look up with prayer, praise, and adoration towards heaven? Because she would embrace all, in which she sees the reflection of the Eternal, who has inspired her, and would also cause everything to vanish before the brightness of His nature. Heaven is the world which stands in the reflection of God, and which vanishes before the majesty of His being. The heavens flee before Him. But if you limit man with his love to earth, if you take from him the 'enthusiasm' whereby he loves the 'enthusiasm' of his neighbour, you take from him his humanity. Woe unto him when the human countenance, in its mysterious significance, is no longer lovely in his eyes; when he no longer greets it in its relation to the Eternal, as the sacred manifestation that he is destined for God!

On the other hand, we cannot conceive of God without man. We come to a mature knowledge of God through acquaintance with His attributes. But His attributes express the relations of His nature to reasonable beings, to beings whose existence must, at least by us, be apprehended through the human type of spiritual creatures. God is righteous. How can His righteousness be manifested, but in relation to spiritual beings who are to be its objects? God is Love. How can He be love without calling into existence beings worthy of His love, that is, beings of His own nature? But when the deepest of the divine doctrines, the doctrine of the Trinity, is fully developed, it must be acknowledged that God has from eternity, cherished His Son in His nature, and that in His Son He has ever beheld and chosen man. Thus also does holy Scripture conceive the nature of God. He is the God of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob. He has an eternal covenant with His elect. He loved and chose them for ever, before the foundation of the world. They who assert that God might very well have left the world uncreated, obscure the eternity of His love, while intending to exalt His freedom. But they obscure not only His freedom by representing it as absolute and arbitrary, but the eternity of His word, and even His

very personality, when they transform the eternal reality of His being into a state of uncertainty, or the contemplation of a bare possibility. We cannot conceive of God without Christ, nor of Christ without man; therefore we cannot form a conception of God without manhood.

It lies in the very nature of the love of God that He will not remove from man, and it is equally in the nature of the destiny of man that he cannot remove from God.

When the prophets speak of God's covenant oath which He swore by Himself, that He would bring man again into union with Himself, they express figuratively, but with the most glorious assurance, the truth that the relation of God to man is an eternal one, and that He will never remove from him. He cannot change His nature. But His nature is love, which has fixed upon its object from eternity. His love is as strong as hell and as death. Even when He punishes man, and casts him down into hell, He manifests, by the jealous zeal of his justice, that He will not remove from him. And if the strongest and hardest words be uttered concerning the separation between God and man in his evil nature, if the eternity of punishment be spoken of, what else is said but that the punishments of hell are divine and heavenly? Is then eternity an infinite number of years, or the endlessness of time? Mutilated theological notions have certainly caused an arithmetical, to take the place of a religious idea of eternity. But eternity, as a religious idea, is the infinite, the divine, in time itself. Only where God is, is eternity. Hence the eternity of punishment is the consecration of punishment, in which God is present to the lost in holiest concealment. But where He is present, His whole self is there,¹ even as love. God never removes from man.

But neither can man remove from God. He cannot, even if he would. His conscience is the objective religiousness of his nature, and this becomes his torment in proportion as he, by subjectively blinding his nature, converts it into an irreligious one. In proportion to the dislocation of a limb, do we experience pain and utter cries for healing; and thus is it also with man's spiritual perversion. Man cannot free himself from the eternal relation of his being to the being of God: he cannot put off his moral nature and assume a merely physical nature, nor become a pious animal

¹ [Augustine's 'quæ implens omnia, te toto implens omnia.'—ED.]

instead of a pious spirit. If he tries to make himself a mere animal, he becomes an evil demon. As, in the mythical primitive slime, the swine and the serpent grew together into a dragon, so man can neither degenerate into the serpent-like diabolic without falling into animal lusts, nor surrender himself to his animal nature without the serpent-like qualities springing up in full malignity.¹ Who ever saw a man part with his religion unharmed? The trust in God which he gives up is changed into positive mistrust, peace into rancour, sound judgment into destructive error, good-will into hatred. The wicked have to do with God as well as the good. They almost talk more about Him, though blasphemously, and their very blasphemies terribly show that they cannot leave God alone. Herein lies the proof of the eternity of religion. The strongest defence of Christianity consists in the fact, that such Christians as would unchristianize themselves become bitterly unchristian and fiercely antichristian. If Christianity were but an incident, a kind of fetish, man could part from it peaceably. But because it is religion, in all its spiritual glory, even the history of its opponents affords the strongest proofs that man cannot remove from God.

It is a part, however, of the nature of that love by which God is related to man, and of that religion by which man is related to God, that there should be a perpetual attraction between God and man—an attraction sufficiently powerful to overcome the repulsion whose tendency is to destroy the relation—an attraction whose aim is the establishment of a relation between God and man which should be nothing less than their strictest union, the glorification of God in man and of man in God, the reconciliation through the God-man. The manifestation of this attraction between God and man, is celebrated in the history of the elect in the Old Testament. God appears as the God of Abraham, making a new covenant with him and with his people. Jacob, the representative of the chosen people, appears as the Israel, the man wrestling with God, to draw Him into his own life. The history of God's dealings with Israel, is the history of a continuous reciprocity of attraction between divinity and humanity terminating in the God-man, Immanuel. In the course of this process God promises His people that He will

¹ See Matt. vii. 6.

eternally betroth Himself to, and espouse them (Hos. ii. 19, 20 ; Isa. xxv. 7). From the people, on the other hand, arises the yearning cry : Oh that Thou wouldest rend the heavens, that Thou wouldest come down ! (Isa. lxiv. 1). They are but ill acquainted with the import of the Old Testament religion, who see in it merely the contrast of a commanding God on the one hand, and a people yielding a forced obedience on the other.¹ This contrast is only the element, the key-note of the Old Testament series ; but from the beginning its cause is the free and covenant transactions between Jehovah and the people. God wooed Israel as a bridegroom his bride. A relation of constraint and terror is absolutely out of the question. The history of this great attraction is moreover the revelation of an eternal and fundamental relation between divinity and humanity. The election of Israel is the type and pledge of the election of the world. So Homer sang, first for the Greeks, then for all people. It is time we ceased to see in the covenant God of Israel merely a heathen national God.

But how can it be maintained that the attraction outweighs the repulsion ? For this reason, that the attraction is essential, it is part of the nature ; the repulsion accidental, an excrescence of the nature. The justice of God is the eternal rule and form of His love. Hence it can never abolish His love, but only conceal it, and cause it to assume the appearance of its opposite. God, in His justice, is angry with the sinner, but He does not hate him.² [His wrath is but the zealous burning of a grieved love,] as the storm in nature is a manifestation of the impulse of the air to restore the interrupted balance, or as the catastrophe

¹ Compare Hegel's Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion, vol. ii. p. 74. Hegel has so little comprehended the nature of the Hebrew religion, that he believes he can perceive in the Phœnician religion a transition from the religion of the Old Testament to the supposed more exalted religion of the Greeks, and therefore a spiritual progress, p. 78.

² [' Thus the divine anger in its deepest ground is love : love becomes consuming fire to everything which is opposed to it, to the very nature of the good. Love could not be in earnest with itself if it did not negative its negation.'—Müller's *Christian Doctrine of Sin*, Clark's Translation, i. 265. And with what follows regarding the consistency of eternal punishment with God's attributes and man's condition and nature, cf. the satisfactory remarks of the same author, vol. ii. pp. 483–488 ; also Mansel's *Bampton Lectures*, Lec. vii. p. 220, 2d edit.—Ed.]

in history is a manifestation of the zeal of retribution, destroying at a blow the long accumulation of guilt. Therefore mercy rejoiceth against judgment (Jas. ii. 13). But the more man perverts his nature, the more does his nature cry out to heaven, in anguish, torment, and dismay, against its perversion. How long can this state of things endure? It *can* endure eternally, because man is a child of eternity, because he is free. If we say it can only last a hundred, or only a thousand years, we say man is no genuine spirit, he is not really capable of being a demon. But if he cannot be for ever a wanderer from God, neither can he be for ever united to Him; for the possibility of his eternal happiness is involved in the possibility of his eternal misery. This possibility is the outer circle, in which the love of God, almighty love, strives with the lost child of a divine race. Thousands rush into its embrace at the first glance of its countenance. Daily does it celebrate victories, progressively greater and more universal. The slight preponderance of the attraction between divinity and humanity over the repulsion, becomes ever more and more apparent.

But the end is their union: God purposes to unite Himself completely with humanity, and to develop in it the fulness of His nature, because He has made it the organ of His manifestation, and impressed His own nature upon it; because He stands to it in the relationships of the covenant, of spiritual communion, and of love. It is His Sabbath, when He celebrates His manifestation in human hearts. The position which the Mahomedan believes his God to be maintaining—a position of distance from the world—belies the nature of God. He *must* break through this covering, the world, to communicate Himself to His child. And equally does the separation between God and the world, which the deist interposes by means of a course of natural laws heterogeneous to the religious spirit, contradict the divine nature; these restraints also must fall. And finally, when the priesthood holds up the Catholic Church as an invisible medium between God and the Christian people, this is also contrary to the nature of His grace, which chooses to be free for the hearts, and in the hearts of men. It is not till God manifests in the Church herself His own nature, His Spirit, and not merely the reflection or terror of His nature in constrained fear and worship—till the Church, therefore, through the glory of His Spirit, testifies, as the

priestly bride, of His presence in her midst,—it is not till then, that the attraction in which God offers Himself to man has attained its full purpose.

Man, indeed, may long err and stray from God. He may often pause and decline on his way towards Him. But he does not reach his destination, nor obtain rest, till he has attained to the life of the spirit, in God. We must not be deceived by the strongest, nor even by the most dazzling appearance, in which the constrained religionist (he who is bound to the external temple, to the external sign, to the priest, by natural piety) seems to rest and to worship. A people out of which the priests are taken, cannot, as a laity, have attained its end. A people out of which the theologians are taken, cannot finally rest in undeveloped, unproved, and constrained piety. A people, finally, from which Christ descends according to the flesh, cannot celebrate the festival of its perfection, till it has attained the essential freedom and holiness of the priestly and kingly spirit of Christ. And even should it slumber for a thousand years on the path to its final destiny, it will, it must awaken. The drawing of Christ's Spirit will leave it no rest. Man has not arrived at his destined end till he knows himself to be entirely apprehended by God, and God to be fully apprehended by his inner nature, till he knows even as he is known (1 Cor. xiii. 12).

The life at once divine and human, however, which was to proceed from the union of God with man, could, from its very nature, be perfected only in the most exalted individuality standing in mutual action with the highest universality.

God never communicates Himself to mankind simply in its universality. The communication of eternal life, or of the Spirit of God, presupposes a divine race, raised in its inner nature above the relations of time and nature—a race of eternal individualities, of imperishable personalities. The argument employed by Christ against the Sadducees, to prove to them from the law the doctrine of immortality, is in fact the most striking one which can be found. God calls Himself the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; consequently they live eternally, for God is not a God of the dead, but of the living (Luke xx. 37). The life of the Spirit of God, then, cannot so be given to humanity as that it should be received by the species only, and not by the individual. For this life does not begin in man till his ele-

vation above the mere life of the species, is manifested in the sphere of individual and personal life.¹ God communicates His life to man by entrusting it first of all to the elect, to the most susceptible, the deepest, the most faithful individuals. They, however, do not come to God as strangers: He purposes, He loves, and sends them; therefore they appear in the world. In every elect man there is a threefold relation: first, he appears wholly as a being beloved of God; secondly, as a messenger of God, the instrument of a divine blessing to the world; thirdly, as a central point in humanity, enclosing and embracing as many men as his powers and his mission can reach. Thus we see God enter into communion with universal human life by means of individual life. But will He not proceed from the elect to the more elect in His manifestation of Himself, till the most elect appears? Must not *the* manifestation of the divine purpose, *the* beloved of God, at length appear, in whom the whole counsel of His love towards man shall be disclosed? Once, in the fulness of time, the man does appear who, as the well-beloved of God, forms the centre of the community. Thus is He the One, in the sight of God, by reason of the reality which God hath given Him, in that He hath bestowed upon Him the fulness of His gifts and of His Spirit, that He may communicate them to man. The beloved of God is, however, one with this gift; and hence He is all agency—an agency which penetrates to the very foundation of humanity, and embraces its circumference. Thus is He the very image of God, His manifestation in the flesh.

But for the same reason He is also the Son of man. Man turned with yearning towards God, as He turned with blessing towards him. Man's eye met God's eye. The sighs of humanity pleaded with the Spirit of God. His chosen ones were human saints; His manifestations were made before human faces; His victories were the sufferings of joyful martyrs. Renowned and holy men of God appeared and prepared His way; but in the long series there was none without spot and blameless. In each, the old schism between the flesh and the

¹ ['Man could not become conscious of God as his God if he were not a personal spirit, divinely allied, and destined for eternity, an eternal object (as an individual) of God, and thereby far above all natural and perishable beings, whose perpetuity is that of the species, not the individual.'—Neanander, *Life of Christ*, Bohn's Translation, p. 399.—ED.]

spirit was alive, in each there was organic imperfection ; in none was there the whole depth of the race, the purity of its origin, the maturity of its aspirations,—till the last descendant of Jesse, the last in the series of the prophets, appeared. On Him was bestowed the anointing with the eternal fulness of God, for He was the God-man. In Him the race of man attained the individual end of its development, its depth, its unity, its approval in the sight of God. By the formation of the divine-human life in the race, its future was prepared ; but it was only by the appearance of the matured divine-human life that it could be bestowed upon mankind in general. Yes, He must first be perfected by the completion of His work and destiny, before the Spirit of God could come upon man as the Holy Spirit. For not till this completion was the sin of the world atoned for, outweighed, and abolished by an infinitely perfect righteousness ; the sinful nature of man consumed to its very core, and transformed by the Spirit of God ; and an agency thus created, which might reach to and change humanity to its foundations, and fill it to the utmost limits of its circumference. Humanity had now, in so far as it was one with Christ, its praise of God in its longing after the righteousness of God, and its Redeemer in Him, according to the whole difference existing between His life and its own. In this glory and redemption of mankind which was manifested in Christ however, the heart and nature of God Himself were most intimately disclosed to the world—the Son of man is the Son of God. He who was certified as the Holy One in the midst of time, is the chosen one from the depths of eternity. His life is the manifestation of the deep things of God, and the deep things of men, in the manifestation of the deep things of His divine-human heart. It is the manifestation of the eternal personality.

NOTES.

1. *We cannot conceive of man without God.*—The atheist is ever employed in destroying a feigned and gloomy divinity while denying the true God, who, as the eternal Spirit, is love. The materialist believes in a dark Ahrimanes who has swallowed up Ormuzd. The naturalist makes of the confluence of forces a holy Ganges, which he worships, and in which the personal Being, engulfed and drowned, rushes past him, till he himself

plunges into the dark and sacred stream. Feuerbach, in his work *das Wesen des Christenthums*, lays down the proposition: 'Man's knowledge of God, is man's knowledge of himself. God, as God, is only an object of thought. God is the manifested inner nature, the expressed self of man. So far as thy nature, so far as thine absolute self-consciousness extends, so far thou art God.' If the idolaters of man desire to be consistent, they must renounce the word God. They must manage to make the word *Man* produce the same effect in their circle, as the word *God* does in the religious sphere. The atheistic anthropology might be expressed somewhat in this fashion: 1. Universal man, the unlimited (called God by believers in God). 2. The individual man, the limited. 3. The man-man, or the unlimited-limited, who leads men to rush with unlimited limitation against the limits of their nature, that, breaking through them into limited illimitability or unlimited limitation, they may keep the festival of their twofold humanity. This would be about the manner in which they might express themselves if they confined themselves to their own materials, and did not borrow from us the word *God* and all that is involved in it. In any case there is an entirely new logic if divinity is to be denied, in order to ascribe it to man.¹

2. *We cannot conceive of God without man.*—Holy Scripture is from the beginning raised above Deism, and above the deistic philosophy which seeks to honour the freedom of God by giving it an indeterminate exercise over a field of infinite possibility. Scripture knows that God is love, and that in love, freedom and necessity are one. If God, according to Scripture, made man in His own image, He bestowed upon him also the reflection

¹ [So Saisset (*Modern Pantheism* ii. 122): 'Contemporary Pantheism, forced to choose between an extravagant mysticism which is rejected by all the instincts, good and bad, of our day, and the contrary tendency, decides for the latter, and sacrifices resolutely the personality of God, in hopes of making more of man. What is the result? It destroys human personality. So true is this profound saying of a contemporary spiritualist: "There are two poles of all human science, the personal I, with whom all begins, and the personal God, in whom all ends." Yes, man without God is an enigma,—I know not what,—an inexplicable monster. He has no mission upon earth, and no hope in heaven. Losing his divine ideal, trying to take himself for his ideal, he falls below himself, and his punishment for desiring to be God is, that he ceases to be man.'—ED.]

of His own eternity, and the testimony that He had eternally cherished him in His Spirit. When, according to the prophets, He swore by Himself that He would effect the redemption of man, or announced to the believer, 'I have loved thee with an everlasting love,' these words contain plain expressions of the eternal Trinity of the Godhead, and testimony to the election of man. Does not the oath of God denote Him as self-determined in eternal determination? Does not the love of God, set upon its object from all eternity, raise that object as on eagle's wings above the temporal? The New Testament overflows with this acknowledgment, that believers are chosen before the foundation of the world. It is in accordance with the acknowledged spiritual dignity of the Reformed Church, that she has proclaimed this eternity of the love of God, and of the humanity which it chooses and embraces, though she incurs indeed, the danger of being mistaken by rude conceptions and obscuring representations of this glorious mystery. The Reformed theologians arrived at this doctrine not by the way of Christian speculation, but by that of Scripture exposition; not in opposition to a presupposed absolute temporariness, but to the doctrine of human merit. This doctrine of election is not fundamentally a doctrine of mere election, but a dim intimation of the order in which God appointed the lot of man, whose existence He had already determined: '*Paulus, quum docet nos in Christo electors fuisse ante mundi creationem* (Eph. i. 4), *omnem certe dignitatis nostræ respectum tollit; perinde enim est, acsi diceret, quoniam in universo Adæ semine nihil electione sua dignum reperiebat cælestis pater, in Christum suum oculos convertisse: ut tanquam ex ejus corpore membra eligeret, quos in vitæ consortium sumturus erat*' (Calv. Inst. L. iii. c. 22, 1). Here men are spoken of as already existing in the sight of the electing God; a proof that Calvin had not reached the whole depth of the biblical doctrine of election.¹ Hence it arose, that the doctrine of an election to death was connected with the system: '*Prædestinationem qua deus alios in spem vitæ adoptat, alios adjudicat æternæ morti, nemo, qui velit pius censeri simpliciter negare audet*' (Ibid. L. iii. c. 21, 5). In any case, however, the mind of the Reformed

¹ [On Calvin's statement of the doctrine of election and its relation to subsequent deliverances, see Cunningham's Works, vol. i. pp. 358-370.—Ed.]

Church was turned towards those infinitely deep things of God, and the doctrine, that God had loved believers from eternity, was sedulously inculcated by her. Contrasted with this view of eternity, how infinitely imperfect is the speculation which affirms, 'Hence time appears as the fate, the necessity (Chronos, or Moloch?) of the spirit, which is incomplete in itself.'¹ This substance which is the spirit, is the process by which it becomes that which it is in itself, and it is as this self-reflecting process that it first becomes in itself truly spirit' (Hegel, *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, p. 605). 'The end, the absolute knowledge, or the spirit knowing himself to be spirit, has for its means the remembrance of spirits, as they are in themselves, and as they accomplish the organization of their kingdom. Their preservation viewed from the side of their free existence, appearing in the form of contingency, is history, but viewed from the side of their conceived organization, it is the knowledge of manifested knowledge' (Id. *Phänom.* p. 612). If in the Christian doctrine of election the spiritual intelligence is present even from the beginning, and lays the foundations of the world, it does not arise here till the end of the world, as the result of obscure developments; if in the former, spirits, as eternal images of the love of God, are elevated from ideal into eternal existence, in the latter they are degraded from obscure and real 'contingency' into the unreal world of memory; if in the former, motion served the eternal Being, in the latter, the eternal Being is subject to motion: in the first system, the ruler is the eternal God, in the latter, One developing himself out of time, who remembers as a result, like the pale spirit upon 'The place of skulls,' that spirits have been. It is, however, a doubtful gain, if, to disencumber the idea of God from the necessity of Hegel's system, we so define His freedom in the creation of the world, as to make it appear to exclude His eternal love, predestination, and election. J. Stahl, in his *Philosophie des Rechts*, vol. i. p. 55, notices the more recent system of Schelling in the following manner: 'Schelling calls his present, and the Christian system, the historical, in opposition to the logical system of recent philosophy.

¹ Compare Marheinecke (*zur Kritik der Schelling'schen Offenbarungsphilosophie*, p. 43). The author seems to overlook the fact that every philosophical system, regarding God as a mere process-God, is infected with the spirit of Moloch.

For according to the latter, the world and every individual thing is necessarily included in the nature of God; according to the former, it arose through His voluntary creation.' He therefore also calls his system 'the system of liberty,' and 'the positive system.' For it views all things that exist, as existing because they exist, because their almighty Author chose that they should, not as existing because they 'could not but exist.' The assertion, that it was possible that all that exists might not have existed, opposes the Christian doctrine of election, and also the idea of a God eternally determined by Himself in Himself. If absolute and mere possibility be attributed to Him, He is made uncertain in Himself, and thereby imperfect; if He is contrasted with such a possibility, it appears as a tempter to that eternal love which is one with Himself. In the glory of that love, all the arbitrariness of freedom on the one hand, and all the constraint of necessity on the other, disappear.

3. *God never communicates Himself to mankind in its universality.*—Both the mystic and the scholastic pantheist, having but a mutilated notion of human individuality and personality, cannot but mistake the true significance of the historic Christ. The first maintains that Christ becomes individual always and merely in the children of the spirit: I am Christ, says he, and thou art Christ: every man of the spirit is to become a Christ. He misconceives the organization of men, their disposition to catholicity, according to which it would be contradictory to reality, and also to truth, if there were a Christ from house to house, if the one Christ did not live in all Christians (compare Andersen's *Das protestantische Dogma von der sichtbaren und unsichtbaren Kirche*, p. 56, etc.). The philosophic pantheist, on the contrary, maintains that Christ cannot become individual, but can only appear in the universality of the human species. 'If reality is ascribed to the idea of the unity of the divine and human natures, is this equivalent to the admission that this unity must once have been actually manifested, as never before nor since, in an individual? This is not the manner in which the Ideal is realized: it is not wont to lavish all its fulness in one specimen, and be niggardly towards all others—to express itself perfectly in that one instance, and imperfectly in all remaining instances; it delights rather in pouring out its abundance among a multiplicity of specimens, mutually completing each

other, in an alternation of now appearing, and now again disappearing individuals. And is this no true realization of the idea? Would not the idea of the unity of the divine and human natures be a real one in an infinitely higher sense, if I regard the whole human race as its realization, than if I single out a single individual as such a realization? Is not an incarnation of God from eternity a truer one than an incarnation confined to a definite period of time?"¹ (Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. 3d edit. p. 767). This view of humanity, which deludes itself with the notion that the idea must be niggardly towards all others if it lavishes its fulness upon one specimen, can proceed neither from history, nor philosophy, nor poetry, nor a knowledge of human nature; it is one of those hollow phrases of pantheistic abstraction, which overlooks all the differences of personality in mankind, and can only have meaning in a state of things in which the eternal personality of individuality is dishonoured, and individuals are esteemed mere 'specimens.' For does not history teach us that an idea can be generous to others, while lavishing more or less, or even its whole fulness, upon one 'specimen'? Has, then, the idea of criticism been niggardly towards others, while bestowing its especial favour upon a single individual in our own days? Have the characteristics of the Ideal been described by philosophy as such that it must be seized and carefully pocketed, like money, in the presence of others? Does poetry teach, does nature teach us thus to estimate the spiritual relations of humanity? But it may be easily proved that a divine-human, or spiritual life, which is not individual, is a contradiction. All the products of nature are supported by one eternal Spirit, and all unitedly proclaim that

¹ [The equally significant and closely connected sentences may also be given. 'The key to the whole of Christology is this: that an *idea* instead of an *individual* is set forth as the subject of the attributes which are predicated of Christ by the Church; but then it is a real idea, not a Kantian or unsubstantial one. In an individual, a God-man, these attributes and properties are contradictory, but in the idea of the race they harmonize.' And it may here be remarked, as an illustration of the impotence of even the most reckless and fantastic error to create, that this ideal Christology was, in its tangible results, though grounded on and dressed by a different philosophy, anticipated by Celsus, one of whose objections runs thus: τί δὴποτε εἰς μίαν γυνῖαν ἐπεμψε τοῦτο πνεῦμα; δέον πολλὰ ὁμοίως διαφυσῆσαι σώματα. The whole passage is interesting in this connection, and will be found Orig. cont. Cels. ed. Spencer, p. 329.—ED.]

Spirit; and yet no natural production, as such, is a partaker of the spirit, or a spiritual being. But man has the Spirit, and it is this which raises him above the rank of a specimen. Each individual has in truth the Spirit as a person, and not merely a portion of the Spirit. But it does not follow that the measure of the Spirit is not various, that the Spirit does not overflow from some chosen instruments for the enrichment of others. Now that which is true of spirit in its general nature, is specially applicable to the Holy Spirit of the divine-human life. If He were not individually present, He would not be present at all. For such is the nature of the Holy Spirit that He exalts man to the honour of a personality, eternally chosen by God, reconciled to Him, filled with Him, and raised far above the feeling of being a mere exemplar of his species. But if He is to appear in individuality, His outpouring will correspond with the nature of its organ. The most glorious organ, the central organ, the head of mankind, corresponding in the eternal organism of humanity to the fulness of the Godhead, will be the medium through which this fulness is poured out upon humanity. With this agree the following writers: J. Schaller, *Der historische Christus und die Philosophie*, p. 106, etc., though the usual spiritualistic views of the resurrection of Christ are found, p. 130; Conradi, *Christus in der Gegenwart, Vergangenheit und Zukunft*; Göschel, *Beiträge zur spekulativen Philosophie von Gott und vom Gottmenschen*, which is rich in suggestive thoughts; the essay of A. Schweizer, *über die Dignität des Religionsstifters in Studien und Kritiken, Jahrg. 1834*, iii. and iv.¹

4. The higher the nature of the life that is to be diffused among men, the more significant is its concentration in individuals; and the more extensive is the circle of influence proceeding from these individuals.—Man first appears in the qualities of his merely natural life. In this respect all are equal. All, *e.g.*, were once children. In these qualities, all

¹ [To these may be added, Mansel's *Bampton Lectures*, 1858, especially Lecture v., in the notes to which lecture a great mass of information on this point is contained; Dr Mill's *Observations on the Application of Pantheistic Principles to the Criticism of the Gospel*, or, as it is more commonly styled, *On the Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, Cambridge, 1861; and for the understanding of the present position of pantheistic philosophy, and its application to the points under discussion, Saisset's *Modern Pantheism*, Edin. 1863.—ED.]

are for all. Man next appears in the more distinct quality of sexual life. In this respect one half of mankind is for the other. Man further appears in the still greater distinctness of family life, as manifested in races, in which appear the first foundations of the organization of mankind; and here groups are for groups. The development of this great natural organization forms the nations, which exhibit an organism whose delicate adaptations become ever more apparent as the holiness of Christian nations increases. This scale of natural qualities everywhere points to the region of spiritual life. The sphere of imperishable and spiritual life is announced in the universal appearance of individuality. The individual is plainly an organ of the universal, and of the divine administration of the universal, and not only an organ, but a tone, a peculiarity thereof. Every man is the only one of his kind. If he renounces this uniqueness, as, *e.g.*, in a state of slavery, in partisanship, in a monastic order, this always takes place with the conscious or unconscious reservation, that he will reclaim his peculiarity. And, indeed, he must do so; for each man has his peculiar mission. The Father will not receive him into sabbatic rest in His bosom, till he has delivered His message, till, from his special point of view, he has protested against all that is erroneous in the world. What could even an infinite collection of nullities have to testify? Every individual must, indeed, rise to the universality (catholicity) of the kingdom of God; but this he can only truly attain to by the purest development of his own nature. The region of individual life is everywhere pervaded by a gentle breathing of the Spirit, a gale of eternity. But not until the province of individuality is duly estimated as that spiritual kingdom in which each man variously manifests the Spirit, does unity reappear in the midst of diversity, since the Spirit is always one and the same. And thus, as His instruments, all are for all.

In this general circle, however, special talents appear. These are the comprehensive, the auspicious forms of various kinds, in which are concentrated the blessings poured out upon the race, or even the curse which desolates it. As representative forces, as representative spirits, they draw together the scattered operations of human life, and collect them into a unity, to pour

them out again in individual freshness on the mass. In special talents, the general capabilities of races are exhibited in happy forms and peculiar groupings; and these talents, when they answer their appointed end, advance the good of the race. Thus the many are for all.

But the men of genius form a still narrower group, and their sphere of operation is greater than that of the men of talent. It is characteristic of their operations that they are, not indeed absolutely, but relatively, of a creative kind. They bring to maturity that which is in process of formation, and introduce something new into the world, a new blessing or a new curse. They make mighty efforts in behalf of their contemporaries. They are in constant danger of being either idolized or persecuted, because the power with which they are filled, flowing from them in wide circles, repels all that is inimical, and moves and shakes to its very depths all that is congenial.

But the men of genius also, within their own circle, present a rich variety, and separate themselves into their special departments, though it is of the nature of genius to exhibit a high degree of generality. It is by decided limitation on one side or the other, that talent obtains its appointed power and brilliancy, while genius, as such, is always more or less universal genius. And yet in most, a special kind of power is prominent, pointing out to each his special field. In consequence, however, of this division, there are but few in each field. There are but few great artists, great poets, great philosophers; still fewer great prophets. Many are called, but few are chosen. Thus the few are for all.

In the tendency, however, of genius to the universal, we already find the striving after the highest unity. The elect were the prophets of the One Elect. The express image of the Divine Being and of humanity was at some time to appear in one personality, in which the creative forces and principles should solemnize their union, and thus exhibit themselves in a new, a second, a higher man. This One is the concentrated expression of the tendency of all mankind towards the Eternal: therefore, the Son of Man. Hence His agency extends to the whole race. Thus the One is for all.

From this head, and from His agency, is developed the infinitely rich and marvellous organization of the life of mankind.

SECTION II.

THE PERSONALITY OF MAN.

The existence of personality in man is accompanied by individuality. So long as man lives in a savage and brute-like state, he seems to be, more or less, a mere exemplar of his species. It is said to be difficult to distinguish one countenance from another among the wild hordes inhabiting the steppes of Northern Asia. The peculiar nature of man is in this instance still hidden, and he appears merely a savage creature, or, to speak more correctly, a creature who has become savage. And yet these faces, void as they are of expression, recognise each other: the dawning of individuality, at all events, exists. The more, however, man receives the blessing of education, and especially the consecration of religious awakening, the more is individual life developed in him. That infinite singularity becomes apparent, which distinguishes him as a being elevated above the rank of a mere exemplar, and characterizes each man as a hitherto non-existent type of humanity. The certainty of immortality is contained in this singularity. For it is through this that he is a new, a special, a definite purpose of God, an eternal determination of the divine will. With the annihilation of a distinct individuality we should impute a want of determination to God. But the individuality and personality of man are ever mutually developed. It is only because he is an individual that he is a person; and it is only in the infinite definiteness and isolation of his being that infinite generality can appear. It is in the property of individuality that creature existence attains that silvery brightness of spirituality which testifies that the universal, and the voice of God in the universal, can now be resounded by the metal of which it is composed. The sharply defined figure of the crystal is an image of individuality, the sun-light reflected therein an image of personality. The more a man perceives, faithfully preserves, and sincerely develops the peculiarity, the inmost depths of his nature, the more does the fulness of the Spirit, the glory of God, the richness of His world, begin to be manifested in him. Individuality is therefore the eternal form, or even the form of the Eternal.

This is the stone against which the prevailing philosophy of the day stumbles and is confounded. She regards the individual as only a limitation of the general. According to her premises, the evil cleaving to substance, the evil of the world, viewed according to Manichean notions, has taken refuge in the form of the spiritual. In her view, all is divine; only the eternal characteristics, the mystic lines which the human countenance forms by its constant expressiveness, these are fatal to her. In her opinion, substance is limited in its divine flow by those lines which form the individual life. It must burst these boundaries and break through their opposition.¹ As the boy plucks the flower to get at its scent, as the spiritualist would destroy the letter to find the spirit, so does this last and most subtle Manichean view of nature shatter that eternal form of the spirit, individuality, to advance universal being in its triumphal progress through the ages. Since it makes man originate from a process of nature, he must inevitably sink again into nature. As is the gaining, so is the spending: 'Light come, light go.' But because this view lacks the eternal determination of the spirit, it lacks also the eternal Spirit Himself. That dark obscure substance in a state of constant fermentation, which is neither self-possessing, self-penetrating, nor self-determined, can neither appear in personality, nor form a real individual. Such philosophy is a stranger to the conception of the eternal.

In the perfect or divine-human life, the contrast of individuality and personality must be manifested in all its heavenly purity. Here we see a man who is never lost and dispersed in mere creaturehood, who never obliterates the constant characteristics of his being; who ever most distinctly expresses in his spiritual nature the eternal appointment of God. He continues true to himself, and therefore faithful to God. His voice was

¹ 'The true being of man is rather his deed; in this his individuality becomes actual, and it is this which puts an end to the intention in both its aspects. First, as a substantial, passive existence: individuality presents itself in action as the negative nature which is only in so far as it puts an end to existence. Then, again, the deed puts an end to the unutterableness of the intention in presence of the self-conscious individuality, which, in the intention, is infinitely defined and defineable. In the fully formed deed this worthless infinity is annihilated.'—Hegel's *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, p. 242. Such statements consist with the crude ideas of the author on Physiognomy.

an echo of that purity which it had by the divine appointment ; therefore a call of the Father, an announcement of salvation from God Himself. It was thus that Christ appeared to us. He plainly declared His nature and the mission resulting from it, and stamped the intrinsic value of His nature with an impression of most sacred and faithful distinctness. He asserted His spirituality in the presence of all nature. And what was the result ? All nature began to shine with spiritual brightness in the mirror of His spirit ; the birds of heaven and the lilies of the field became, through Him, thoughts of God. He contended for, and victoriously maintained, against the whole world, the sanctuary of His divine Sonship ; and therefore did the whole world, in its ruin and in its call to blessedness, begin to shine with the light of His love and righteousness. His faithfulness to His individuality was also exhibited in this, that He showed to His Father His whole heart, even its grief, that He did not obliterate this distinct feature of His nature in an enthusiastic heroism, which would have hindered the glorification of the Father in Him. By the solemn earnestness which consecrated the place on which He stood, He transformed the whole world into a sanctuary of God ; by the constant energy with which He lived in the present, He transformed all ages ; by the manner in which He laid hold of passing events, He consecrated them into symbols of the world's history. Yes, the glory of the personal life flowing from Him transfigures both earth and heaven. But while it may be said that He attained His personality in the infinite distinctness of His individuality, the converse is equally true, that He found the unchanging constancy of His nature in His continual and entire submission to the Father. It was by plunging into the sun of personality, that the eagle-like glance bestowed upon Him was developed. And this view of the matter is also the more correct one. What He saw the Father do, that did He as the Son ; and it was by finding Himself in the bosom of the Father, that He felt and knew Himself to be the Son.

In the personality of Christ is manifested the personality of the Father. When it is said, the eternal Being is light in Himself, in Him is no darkness at all, He possesses, He penetrates, He surveys, He wills absolutely,—what is this but to say that He has personality ? God is the most decidedly personal being,

much more so than man, because He cherishes nature not as a necessity to His spirit, but as a form of manifestation for His spirit. But if personality stands in polar relation to individuality, how can God be personal? Do we then say that God, who is the source of all individual, as well as of all personal life, is not an individual? His personality is the eternal light of His Spirit, in its self-determining agency; its antithesis are those eternal determinations (*Bestimmtheiten*) which He cherishes in His being, and which are summed up in that one general determination, in that *character* of His being, in His Son.¹ If, then, these determinations appear in time, they are not therefore absolutely temporal. With the nature of Christ, eternity appears in time, because the Spirit of God, which embraces all times, is manifested in Him; and in proportion as He awakens personality in men, does He awaken eternity in them.

But the personality of Christ not only manifests the eternal personality of the Father, but also proclaims the produced (*werdende*) personality of men. For Christ exhibits in His life the destination of humanity, its inmost depths, which are to be absorbed, delivered, and perfected through Him. And thus by His appearing there is also proclaimed the Church, in which the Spirit of life is ever elevating that which is perishable to the light of the imperishable, and glorifying nature as well as mankind. His personality is the pledge to His Church of a future, in which, through its development and perfection, all the obscurities of nature, all the dark mysteries of evil, shall be pervaded by the light of their manifested relation to eternity, and sanctified to the service of God. The eternal Spirit, as the all-ordaining Being, ordaining Himself in all, is the source of all personal life, the personality of the Father, or even the fatherly personality. The same Spirit, as the Being whose existence is determined with infinite delicacy and sharpness, and who in this determinateness is the Being knowing Himself free, the Blessed One, is the reflection of the Father's glory, the personality of the Son. But the same Spirit, as the Spirit of liberty, bringing back this determinateness of the Son and of His members to the self-determining agency of the Father, through whose presence God is present in His people, so that their life is sunk and lost in His, is the personality of the Holy Ghost, or also the Holy

¹ ὁς ὢν—*χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ*, Heb. i. 3.

Spirit of personal life, who sanctifies the world, and makes it an offering to God. The special province of the Spirit's operations is the Church, whose several individualities, notwithstanding their infinite diversity, and even by the organic relations of that diversity, form one organism, and at the same time one great collection of individualities.

NOTES.

1. The notions *Individuality* and *Personality* express, according to our view, the nature of spirit in a polar relation. Individuality is the point in which spirit comes forth and distinctly manifests itself in nature; personality is the circle by means of which it embraces heaven and earth, and perceives God that it may manifest Him. The mutilation of these notions is connected with all the morbid inclination to abstract generality, to the dark depths of indistinguishable substance, prevalent in these days; and its presence may be traced, like that of a devouring worm, in the principles and tendencies of the new theology. It is evident from the above quotation, that Hegel had not discovered the true notion of an individuality corresponding with personality. *Michelet*, in his lectures on the Personality of God, etc., seems for a moment to touch upon the true significance of individuality. P. 84: 'The true relation of the general and the particular is therefore merely a looking at both sides at once. The particular does but add another definite peculiarity to the contents of the absolutely general, by which peculiarity it is itself distinguishable from other particulars of the same species, just as separate ideas exclude each other through their peculiarities. Particularity is consequently the richest,' etc. Individuality, however, is not mere particularity, and the general is not so poor as to increase in contents through the particular, as this author thinks. Hence an unsatisfactory conception of individuality is already announced. 'It is the *principle of individuation*,—that addition made to generality and speciality,—which forms the great variety, and the distinctive characteristics of individuals. And since the addition is non-essential, all that is great and true in individuals belongs to them by reason of their species.' The principle of individuation, then, that 'anonym,' as Göthe calls it, is here an *addition*, and again this addition is *non-essential*. It is evident that this non-essential addition is incapable of

constituting a human race at all corresponding to the Ideal. On the contrary, it is really the millstone hung round the neck of the subject, to draw it down into the depth of annihilation. 'The general process of species, therefore, consists in withdrawing from one series of peculiarities to appear in others. Peculiarity is eternal; peculiar beings, on the contrary, disappear.'—*Cieszkowsky* also seems, in his work *Gott und Palingenesie*, p. 40, to define incorrectly the relation between individuality and personality, though he maintains the immortality of personality against Michelet. With him individuality is 'the natural, the indifferent, the co-existent, the inflexible, the incidental, the limited, the most peculiar peculiarity,¹—that which not only cleaves to materiality, but also underlies it.' According to *Snellmann*, *Versuch einer spekulativen Entwickelung der Idee der Persönlichkeit*, p. 43, 'an individual is a being which thus ever excludes another, but even thereby becomes ever another.' The contrast between the general and the individual being thus designated in the strongest terms, an unending one, we may well be surprised to find the whole contrast so soon entirely at an end. P. 49: 'The spirit is not distinguished, as the Ego, from the matter of the consciousness; it is not that *it has* this matter, but that it is this matter. There is here, then, no distinction between consciousness and self-consciousness, but both are directly one. For the spirit, as pure self-consciousness, as the Ego, which moreover *has* the matter of the consciousness, is not a *definite one*, an exclusive individual.' This *indistinguishable* identity (and therefore sameness) of consciousness and self-consciousness is, according to p. 242, the idea of personality. This personality is consequently the monotonous spirit, or rather non-spirit, which comes to itself when first in thought, and afterwards temporally in natural death, it abolishes subjectivity (244). Feuerbach carries on the degradation of the subjective to the perishable, to a degree which shows a hatred of it: 'It is not love which completely fills my spirit; I am leaving room for my unloving nature by thinking of God as a subject, distinct from His attributes. The notion of a personal self-existent Being is anything but identical with the notion of love; it is rather something beyond and without love. Hence it is necessary that I should at one

¹ Certainly the ever singular.

time, part with the notion of love, at another, with the notion of the subject (*Das Wesen des Christenthums*, p. 360). Göschel, on the contrary, arrives, by the same premises as Hegel, at the conviction, that it is in the nature of the notion of the Ego, as Ego, as spirit, that the individual Ego is not lost in it, but continues to live and think in it. 'The Ego, in its distinctness from nature, is just this, it is equal to itself. Ego = Ego. Therefore the death of the Ego in the Ego is a contradictory idea' (*Beiträge zur spekulativen Theologie von Gott und dem Menschen*, etc., p. 24). The same author expresses the principle, 'Nothing so much pertains to personality as individuality, and indeed the individuality of the subject' (p. 58). 'The connection is as follows: personality is the highest form of individuality, the pervasive glorification and manifestation of self-existence; on the other hand, subjective individuality, or independence, is the matter and condition of personality.' Here, then, the polar relation between individuality and personality is expressed. The remarks made by Strauss (*Leben Jesu*, p. 735) against the Church doctrine of Christ, or of the union of the divine and human natures in Him, fundamentally oppose the true notion of Personality in general. He appeals to *Schleiermacher, Glaubenslehre*, 2, §§ 96-98, where he finds the expression, that the divine and human natures are united in Christ, difficult and barren. Schleiermacher argues specially against the Church doctrine, which receives two wills in Christ, and remarks that, in this case, we must come to a similar decision with respect to the understanding. Strauss seems, fairly enough, to claim for his assertion the arguments of Schleiermacher, according to which there is said to be something absolutely inconceivable in the Church notion of the God-man. Schleiermacher does not give its full significance to the notion of individuality; consequently he uses a christological expression (p. 56) which even Noëtus or Eutyches might have appropriated. 'The existence of God in the Redeemer is laid down as a primary force from which all agency proceeds, and by which all impulses are connected: what is human, however, only forms the organism for this force, and is related thereto, as being both its receptive and its expositive system.' But how should this organism of Christ have been able, without a will, to receive and exhibit the will of God? And the same reasoning applies to the understanding. Is the

understanding of two men, whose agency is alternately employed, a double one? But as little is it a single one. The understanding and the will, as well as all that is spiritual, all that is personal, bear within themselves the contrast of the objective and the subjective, whose diversity is explained in identity, and their identity in diversity.

The misconception of the personality of the individual, exhibits itself in two extremes which, though exhibiting a mortal aversion, are yet intrinsically united. The one extreme is the tendency of Jesuitism, as an emanation of the Manichean and ascetic aversion to the individual and its corporeity, which has obscured the Romish Church. The other extreme is the tendency of Communism, resting upon the Manichean and pantheistic aversion to the personal and its perpetual definite peculiarity. The annihilation of personality is the final aim of both these tendencies. In the first case, the most unconditional obedience to the general of the order, the most colossal sectarianism, is to extinguish all individuality. Lamennais, in his treatise *Affaires de Rome*, has some excellent remarks on this subject. The Church of Rome exhibits an increasing tendency to establish this principle. *Lacordaire* expresses himself in the *Semeur* (No. 23, 1843) in the following manner: ‘*Ce que Dieu vous demande, c’est de sacrifier votre conviction flottante, uniquement basée sur vos passions et vos préjugés à la conviction une, sainte, et perpétuelle de la cité de Dieu ; c’est l’abjuration de la cité du monde pour l’adhésion complète et libre à l’autorité religieuse, pour la soumission à l’hierarchy et à l’Eglise ; c’est de vous dire une bonne fois à vous même : Eh bien c’en est fait, je me donne à une raison souveraine, immuable, plus haute que la mienne ; moi, atôme misérable, je m’assieds enfin las et confondu sur ce roi inébranlable, qui a pour appui la main de Dieu, et pour garantie de sa durée, son invariable promesse ! Ainsi pénétrés de votre nullité individuelle vous rentrez dans la vie générale.*’—It might be added : *dans la grande nullité, qui résulte d’une telle composition de pures nullités.* On this side, man is required to sacrifice his personality to the mere hierarchy, the historical majority ; on the other, to the multitude, the momentary majority, without the prospect of receiving it back free and transformed, which is the result of the surrender of the life to God. This sacrifice is demanded, because sectarianism as such is a gloomy and demoniacal power,

which can only be formed by trampling down individuality, a thick cloud in which the beautiful and separate colours of natural life form but one dingy mixture. How bright, on the contrary, is the glory of the true Church, as displayed in her adornment of sanctified individualities and their varied endowments! From this one fundamental mutilation, there arise, in the courses of the two above-named extremes, a series of mutilations: the mutilation of the rights of property, of marriage, of the State, of the Church.

2. An individual is a creature which cannot suffer the dissolution of its own proper nature by any dissolution of its outward constituents, which no storm of death can strip of the mighty unity formed by its existence. The word *persona* means, first, the mask worn by an actor, then, the character which he represents, and lastly, an individual, in his characteristic significance. The word personality cannot certainly be referred immediately to *personare*, in such a sense as to make it denote how the general resounds through the individual. But when Snellmann (p. 1 of his collected works) calls this ingenious explanation, far-fetched and unsatisfactory, he forgets that the voice of the actor resounds from the mask, and the general life, represented by poetry, from the dramatic character; that the meaning of the character, moreover, is to express general life in its mature determinateness. It is, at all events, a characteristic trait of pure personality, that the infinite resounds through it.¹

SECTION III.

ORGANISM IN THE PROVINCE OF PERSONAL HUMAN LIFE.

Humanity has its unity first in its natural type, in the primitive natural man, from whom all derive their life and blood. This unity is the unity of species, but also the unity of destination to a spiritual life, and of the perversion of this destination by the fall. This unity has been converted into a sad

¹ [This subject is pursued, and treated in opposition to Strauss, in Müller's *Doctrine of Sin*, ii. 159, etc.—ED.]

uniformity—it is the tragic monotony of the race, that in Adam all die. This is the unity which is now esteemed by many the peculiar glory of the human race. But the higher unity of mankind has been manifested in the God-man, who, in the infinitely rich and divine nature in which He appeared as the head of humanity, announced, and by the agency of His Spirit brought to light, its infinite variety, and the unity existing amidst this variety. In Christ all are made alive; and in this life they form that organic community which He so fills and animates with His divine fulness, that they represent the universal Christ. The God-man develops His life in the organism of the divine-human Church, in whose ideality even Nature is elevated till at length God becomes all in all.

The individuality of each man, which is to be delivered and to come to its maturity and glory through the God-man, is the power, dwelling in its personality, of taking into itself and exhibiting all life. All times, all space, all saints, are present in the heart of the humblest Christian. His memory reaches back to the fall and the creation; his hope extends beyond the close of this world; his inner life has its roots in the centre of time, in the sacred period of Christ's death and resurrection. The East, whence the Gospel issued, as well as the West, to which it proceeded, is his home. Patriarchs, prophets, and apostles visit him, as the familiar friends of his inner life; infinity nestles in his bosom; God Himself comes with His Son, and sups with him; he is an heir of all things. Individuality in its Christian splendour is a diamond whose facets are infinite, that it may receive all the light of infinity.

But the personality of the Christian is an individual one. It is in each a personality infinitely unique, new, and utterly differing from every other. This isolation would repel the whole world, if it were not at the same time personality, life in common. It would be a gloomy divinity, if there could be such a one, if it were not rather, an infinitely limited expression of the eternal God. By means of personality the isolated individual is one with all sanctified individuals; but, this personality, being individual, is again diverse from them.¹

¹ Hence, in its perfection, the new name which no one knoweth, saving he that receiveth it (Rev. ii. 17). This is the development of 'the anonym' in the individual.

The individual is to represent, in infinite limitation, the infinitely unlimited; in the special ray of a single character, the eternal Sun. He is an Ego, therefore an immortal being; a spiritual note in which all creation resounds, therefore also a personality. But because the man restored to his destination by the God-man is both personal and individual, he is a member of the body to which he belongs, of the head from which his life proceeds. He has his special talent, and with it his special relation to all the other members, his special task, his separate stand-point. He has, too, his special one-sidedness, his relative deficiency of talent, in which respect he needs completion by the fulness of the body, and especially by contrasted and kindred members. And even this very deficiency is but a gift of infinite capacity to receive the fulness of blessing stored up in kindred spirits, the means of union with them, of taking up a definite position in the wondrous frame of the body.

When in human life those great individual groups, the nations, oppose and strive against each other, when a constant and painful friction takes place between private individuals, human nature, in this unhappy confusion and self-destruction, seems put to shame by the harmonious association of a flock of antelopes, and by the close ranks of a train of cranes. But even this terrible perversion of its destiny makes it evident that its unity cannot be the uniformity of generic life, the monotony of a collection of exemplars. This continual friction is but the morbid working of the infinite delicacy of its organism, and the loud harshness of the discord testifies to the glory of the lost harmony.

This harmony, this bright and heavenly variety in spiritual unity, is apparent in Christ's kingdom. Peter and John, Thomas and Paul, how different, yet how similar! how clearly do they manifest in their diversity the oneness of the life in Christ and the heavenly richness of this oneness! In the free New Testament Church this is the solution: 'There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God' (1 Cor. xii. 4-6). It is then a proof of true Christianity to exhibit eternal unity in variety, and variety in unity; or, in other words, to show individualities

in the light of personality, and personalities in the varying hue of individualities.

Antichristianity, on the contrary, is matured in such systems as would annihilate individuality, whether they seek, by stifling the singularity of the individual, to exhibit his religious and heavenly generality; or, by rooting out his relation to the Eternal, to cherish his individuality, as a merely animal expression of existence. The former deny the true incarnation of God, the manifestation of the Eternal in the individual; the latter the divine unction of the individual, his glorification in the Eternal. Both would trample on the honour of the subject, to exhibit the honour of the community; thus, however, constituting a community without honour, without divine life, or glory. They would break in individuals, catalogue spirits, mechanize personalities. They misconceive the ideal groundwork of humanity, in conformity with which the Church, in the midst of the greatest abundance of efforts, of contrasts, of diversities, will yet, by means of its infinitely delicate sympathies and antipathies glorified by love, have but one heart and one soul,—one heart raised above time, one soul hovering over all space, one society embracing both the living and the dead in God, to whom they all live through Christ, who unites all as their life-giving head. Individuals may be compared to the linked rings which form a single chain, or which, partially enclosing each other, exhibit a rich tissue of spheres. There are great individuals who partially enclose less individuals, but they are all enclosed in the greatest, and form but one organic unity. As one great general comprises whole hosts, as one great philosopher represents a whole race of minds, so does Christ comprehend human nature. In Him dwells the fulness, the deep insight of a John, the energetic activity of a Peter, the ideal resoluteness of a Paul,—in short, the deep spiritual wealth of the race. Thus, too, in decision, purity, and power, He is the head of the race. He was able with absolute and heavenly certainty, from moment to moment, to discern between truth and error, to conquer the tempter, and with perfect freedom to do the very thing which the Father willed to do through Him. His purity was a bright mirror, reflecting all characters in their several particulars. The murmurs of enemies, the whispers of friends, resounded through His soul. The terrors of earth could pass through His mind. And

so clear was His apprehension, that He was as aware of the world's judgment as of His own. But in power also He surpasses the whole human race. The power of His fidelity and zeal for God, of His victory over the world, is a lasting influence which is ever working, and must work till it has attained its end, till at His name every knee shall bow to the glory of God the Father.

The influence of Christ upon individuals is displayed in their attaching themselves to Him, and conditions the relation in which they stand to Him as His flock. But His influence is a holy one; it respects the freedom of each individual, his destination for God, which is one with the possibility of his condemnation. Hence His Church appears, first of all, in the very-elect and the elect. His influence upon individuals allows of counteraction. He suffers the great contradiction of sinners, and thereby reconciles Himself with them in spite of all their narrowness (this is especially apparent in the relation of the New Testament to New Testament exegesis). But such spirits as follow His leadings, also influence each other. These influences form an infinitely delicate and intricate rhythm: their various relative proportions of fulness, distinctness, brightness, and power give to each a different position with regard to all others. Thus is formed the body of Christ, that eternal organism, animated by the glorious Head, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of God (Eph. i. 23).

In this organism not one tittle of the law passes away; that is to say, every power finds its use and object. Each mind attains its own special experience. Each voice is reckoned upon, and none desires to go beyond the part appointed it, to go beyond its pitch. But each must preserve and manifest its own peculiarity. The honour of God cannot dwell in soundless men, in individuals whose individuality is extinct, whom cowardice has induced to merge themselves in the dark flood of an impersonal substance, or in the opposite but equally dark compound of an enslaved party-nature. The honour of God will dwell in those really honourable ones, those heroes, each of whom has once stood alone beside Christ upon the hill of martyrdom, and has, in spite of all the world, and in order to be faithful to all the world, preserved his most sacred possession for his Lord. These as the children of God, the joint heirs with Christ.

Every child of God has received something special, some peculiar characteristic, from his Father. Each is endowed with a power which can concur with the powers of others, but only in Christ. Hence every child of man must be a protestant, must be inwardly independent of every other man, and fall into the arms of Christ, to attain to true catholicity. In each separate Christian, Christ is manifested anew in a special aspect of His divine glory. But formerly, in His personal manifestation, He exhibited in unity that fulness which is now disclosed in diversity, in His Church; and thus with Him eternity enters into time.*

NOTES.

1. The relations of developed individual life are infinite.—How great is the variety exhibited even by a man's social position! The same individual is at the same time child, husband, father, brother, friend, subject, superior, companion, and fills many other relations, too numerous to mention. In each of these several relations his disposition is seen in a different light, or exhibits a different reflection of the surrounding world. Christianity, however, in the perfection of its influence, transforms him into a diamond lighted up by the fulness of God, makes him an heir of God. Are not all men, then, in this respect perfectly equal? They that are perfect are equal in this respect, that they all see God. But as the image of the sun is larger in a lake than in a dew-drop, and as light assumes different hues in different jewels, so does infinite diversity exist among men with respect to their capacities for receiving into themselves the life of God.¹

2. There is no absolute absence of talent among men, but only a relative one. That side of the individual on which he appears unendowed, is, when rightly improved, that on which he most ardently unites with the whole community, and devotes himself to it. Thus, even limited talent is not a positive limitation, but rather a passive reciprocity which makes the individual such a member of the kingdom of God as stands truly in need of its communion and fellowship.

3. In great national wars, national individualities seem to come into collision, that their several and peculiar natures may be more evident.

¹ Comp. 1 Cor. xv. 40; Rev. xxi. 19.

4. It is quite natural that any single gift of Christ should assume a different aspect in any one of His witnesses, from that which it does in Himself; for in Him it is modified by the fullness of all gifts. Thus there may seem to be more power in the ministry of John; but if we compare the words of Christ against Pharisaism with those of the Baptist, the surpassing dignity of Christ's person is perceived even in this particular. All the splendid single virtues in which each of God's heroes have appeared so great, blend in wondrous harmony in Him; and it is for this very reason that He is the fairest among the children of men, for in His perfect beauty the several and various components disappear in the ideal unity of the whole. On the union of various spiritual gifts in Christ, see *Conradi, Christus in der Gegenwart Vergangenheit und Zukunft*, p. 97, etc.

5. As there should be a due appreciation of both those forms of life, individuality and personality, as harmonious contrasts mutually needing each other; so should there be an equally just appreciation of those forms of life, Protestantism and Catholicity. The former may be defined as the individuality of the Church in general, the latter as its personality. But both these essential characteristics of the Church are united. Through its personality or Catholicity, the Church must be free from all the exaggerations, adulterations, and spurious admixtures of individuality or Protestantism. But, on the other hand, the riches of its personality must be unfolded in its Protestant individuality—its personality must be delivered from the monkish cowl which would gradually stifle its vitality, and from the dead uniformity thereby produced. Catholicity, without Protestantism, is a mere sect. For it is the nature of a sect to repress individuality, to abolish its peculiar gifts and lasting distinctions, in order to exhibit unity. How free, how vital was the Catholicity of the apostolic Church, in which the Apostle Paul boldly opposed Peter in his error at Antioch, and the Apostle James the degeneracy of Pauline Christians; in which each Church shone distinct from all others in the light of its own peculiar vocation! We are thus taught how firmly true Protestantism will adhere to true unity, and how this unity of the Church not only permits but requires the free development of the individual life of each of her members.

The Church of Christ should consequently be thoroughly conscious of her vocation. For she has to deal on one side with a sectarianism which would destroy all individuality, on the other, with a separatism which threatens to exhibit a separate church and society in each individual. This sectarianism appeared in the ecclesiastical form of Jesuitism, in the secular one of Communism. Both these tendencies resemble each other in the effort to exhibit a perfect society by the annihilation of its varying individual components. They may be considered as the most matured productions of sectarianism ; the one demanding this false and fearful sacrifice from men to gain the world for heaven, the other to gain heaven for the world. Separatism over against this sectarianism, exhibits an equal measure of error, and indeed in a similarly twofold aspect ; first appearing in ecclesiastical pride, as an enemy of all Church organization ; then in secular pride, as an opponent of all political order in society. The erratic courses, however, of both these enormous exaggerations lie very near each other.

SECTION IV.

THE FULNESS OF THE TIME.

Time and space are no gods, for this, if for no other reason, that time intersects space, and space time. We can, however, hardly escape from the idolatry of these powerful forms of the world's development. It seems most difficult for man to free himself from the notion that time is a god. Even the boldest philosophical systems, unassisted by the spirit of Christianity, in treating of the origin of the gods in time, are for the most part infected with the superstitious assumption that time is itself a god. In this case they do homage to Chronos, who devours his own children, who consumes personalities ; to Moloch, to whom children are sacrificed ; to the process-god, who destroys individualities in order to become entirely himself. The Grecian was delivered from Chronos by Zeus, who instituted an everlasting Olympus and a transposition of human heroes into the

community of the immortal gods. The Hebrew was freed from Moloch by Jehovah, the eternal God, who in His covenant faithfulness is in all ages equal to Himself, and who also elevates His elect to His own eternity. The religious consciousness, however, of many philosophers has not yet attained either to the worship of Jupiter or the service of Jehovah, since they still expose their children by sacrificing the personal immortality of man to a god confounded with time—a god in process of becoming such.¹

This idolatry of time is connected with the idolatry of nature. Nature is the slow development of the Spirit. The greatness of natural philosophy consists in its discovery of the gradations of development in the life of nature and of man; but it is its limited nature which is exhibited, when these gradations of development are regarded as periods of origin in the consciousness of God Himself. Nature is confounded with the act of creation, and even regarded as the Creator, when the subsequent is looked upon as the mere product of the antecedent, the higher as the mere birth of the lower. Thus the elements are made to arise from an effort and interworking of the original principles of nature, and the organic products from the elements, and always new and higher formations from those already existing, till at length man appears as the head of animal existence. It is indeed quite justifiable to estimate the origin of spiritual life by such gradual developments. But whenever a higher product is formed from one formerly existing, unless origination is distinguished from existence, its highest quality, *i.e.*, its peculiar idea, its soul, and thus the very principle which is essential to it, must be surreptitiously introduced. The natural philosophy which would construct the higher out of the lower, is full of such surreptions. The elements may be made to weave as long as we please; but if a plant is to be originated, a new idea, and

¹ [Hegel, Schelling, Baur, and their followers, are forced by the principles of their philosophy to repudiate the idea of a 'fulness of time' in the Christian sense. As has been shown in a previous chapter, they can admit no such incarnation as this requires, no single, historical incarnation, which happens once for all. To become man is, as it were, God's eternal attribute and destiny, which, as God, He is always fulfilling, and men accordingly are reduced to mere 'phenomenal manifestations' of God. In this sense God becomes incarnate in every man, and through all time; and if there is a 'fulness of time,' it is only because one man, say Jesus, has more strikingly than others revealed the eternal and infinite.—ED.]

indeed a more concrete and powerful one than that of the elements, must be introduced among them, to assume their material according to its necessities, and to assimilate it into its own life. With each new gradation of life, a new idea actually appears as a new vital principle—an idea certainly announced and prepared for, but not created, by preceding formations. And it is in the very singularity, novelty, and power, by which it is raised above previous formations that its peculiar nature is apparent.¹ We shall thus be obliged to allow that new forms in the ascending scale of life do not make their respective appearances merely as natural products, but as the thoughts and works of God. Nature, indeed, dreams of her future, and foretells it in obscure foreshadowings. But these very dreams of nature are only the result of the thoughts of God already working in her, and about to appear in new creations. Thus nature may be said to form a great number of concentric circles. New circles are ever appearing, each tending towards the centre. These do not, however, proceed from nature, but from a new creation and from eternity. Thus, *e.g.*, within the circle of minerals is the circle of plants; within the circle of plants, that of the brute creation; within this, that of mankind; within the circle of mankind, the circle of the elect.

Here, moreover, the subsequent and the higher is not only as primordial as the former and lower; but with respect both to its own importance and the power which appoints it, it does, in the very nature of things, take precedence thereof in the mind of God. What John the Baptist said of Christ, 'He that cometh after me is preferred before me, for He was before me,' might equally be said by the plant of the stone, or by the lion of the plant. For the circles gradually tending towards the centre of life ever increase in depth. In each new circle appear the principles for whose sake the former were produced, and which, in their import, include and take up preceding formations.

¹ Compare Streffen's *Alt und Neu Beurtheilung dreier naturphilosophischer Schriften Schellings*, p. 20; Rosenkranz, *Schelling*, p. 87; *Hegel Logik*, 2d Part, *die Lehre vom Begriff*, p. 209. 'The more the teleological principle has been connected with the notion of a supernatural understanding, and so far favoured by piety, the further has it appeared to depart from true natural philosophy, which sees in the properties of nature, not alien, but inherent certainties.'—P. 210. 'The aim is the conception objectively realized.'—P. 219.

In man appears the principle of all the days of creation. God first formed the earth, and made plants and animals. But man was nevertheless that principle in the mind of God, whose life called all nature into life.

Mankind forms another rich system of circles. Still deeper and still more powerful natures appear towards the centre,—the noble, the holy ones, the first in the truest sense, though frequently the last to appear. In the centre appears the God-man. Here is the veriest centre of the circle, here its fulness and depth; the consciousness in which God is one with man; hence the whole depth of Godhead and the whole depth of humanity, and therefore the essential principle, the First-born, the Eternal, in whom God made the world.

But because Christ has this significance in the midst of the world's history, time has its consummation in Him, and eternity appears with Him, and in Him, in the midst of time. Before time was, He was in God as the principle, the root, the motto of the world. Could the world have been conceived as a composition or fundamental idea without a motto? He will be, too, when time is no more, as the head of a new world, in which nature will be glorified in the spirit, the spirit incorporate in nature. Thus Christ is the Alpha and Omega in the development of the world. Hence His appearance in the midst of time has a depth and significance including both the beginning and the end. If we contemplate the *æon* of the natural world of mankind, His life may be designated as the end of the world. But on this very account His life is equally the beginning of the world, the foundation of a new and eternal world of mankind. As the light, the power, the saving life, the sanctifying Spirit, Christ forms the centre of the world, a centre whose influences penetrate all its depths, till they break forth in brightness on all points of its circumference, till the triumphant banners of the divine-human life float upon all the battlements of creature life. The coming of the Son of man will be like a flash of lightning, shattering the Old World from east to west, and discovering the New World in its spiritual glory.

In every normal birth, the head first makes its appearance from the parent's womb. Therefore was the new, glorified, and spiritual humanity first born into the world in its head. But the members follow the head. Therefore the external organism

of Christ's Church struggles out of the obscurity of natural life, that it may exhibit in its completeness the phenomenon of the eternal life.

Spirit is in its very nature eternal. But life is, in its natural appearance, transitory. Hence man remains for a long time in holy hesitation between eternity and transitoriness, because he is at once a structure of nature and a spiritual being—a union of the two powers. But the eternal Spirit must elevate his perishing nature into His own element, into the glory of eternal life. Christ fulfilled this appointment. By His victory He has changed this hesitation between time and eternity, into the triumph of eternity. And by communicating His spirit to His people, nature is ennobled and spiritualized in them and by them, and raised by means of His victorious resurrection to the Eternal. Hence the Church of Christ has ever had the feeling and expectation of being near to eternity, because, filled with the principle of eternity, she is ever ripening with silent but powerful growth for eternity.

It is in the very nature of things, that the whole history of the world, before Christ, should, both in great and small matters, point to Him in the realm of ideal life, as well as work towards Him in the realm of actual life. In all those great and little affairs of the world which have essential reference to the climax of the future, to Christ, tendencies and preludes may be perceived, whose fulfilment is given in Christ. And thus is time fulfilled in Him. We see here both the yearning of humanity after God, that is, its craving after eternity; and the satisfaction of this yearning, namely, the manifestation of God as it gradually dawned upon rough and sinful human nature in the ecstatic visions of patriarchs and prophets, until the time of its full appearance came. The life of Christ is the manifestation of eternity in time, because it is the manifestation of God Himself, because it forms the eternal centre of humanity, discloses and savingly restores the eternal destiny of mankind, and by its power transforms all nature into spirit. Christ came into the world from the Father, and therefore entered time from eternity. But then He left the world again, to go to the Father. He will not, however, return alone, but with His people. He will raise them up to share His own exaltation, that is, out of time into eternity, into the spiritual life, whose light

shows all times in every moment, all worlds in every place, all hearts in every heart, eternal, tranquil, solemn unity in all the changes of infinite variety.

NOTES.

1. When it is settled that time and space are no gods, it is at the same time decided that God is not limited by time and space, and is therefore not a developing (*werdender*) God. But not only God, but man also, as a being of divine extraction, is raised in his own nature above time and space. Even in his relation to time, man is as 'the happy one for whom no hour strikes,' not to mention his being, as a partaker of salvation, a timeless being, whose memory and hope are ever pointing out the flight by means of which he soars, eagle-like, above the temporal. He is in the essence of his nature above time. This characteristic of his inner nature is the natural basis of prophecy. The prophet passes above and beyond the present and the temporal, by means of the divine Spirit. In His light he beholds the future. But man can as little retreat from, as advance beyond the external present, without the co-operation of the Spirit. He cannot even appropriate history without His intervention. The very forms of language express this elevation of man above time. By the words: I was—he places himself in the past; by the words: I shall be—in the future. The Greek Aorist especially expresses this hovering above time. With respect to his relation to space, man is comprised in an eternal tissue stretching into infinity; hence the poetic attraction of the mind towards the blue distance. But in his renewal through the Spirit of God, he is a king, constantly obtaining a new purple from the treasury of the kingdom when the old has grown obsolete, and whose resurrection is pledged, by the power of his spiritual life over the visible world. Misconceptions of eternity, whose theological result is the destruction of the noblest dogmas, whose philosophical result is the destruction of the noblest ideas, are connected with misconceptions of personality. Thus time becomes an ever-produced line, never finding or exhibiting repose in the sacred circle of eternity;¹

¹ 'Natural history takes the exactly opposite course (to the ordinary view of nature). Nature is, in her view, originally only active. All nature is ever changing and ever changeable, and change itself, the only constancy.'

and finite being rushes breathlessly, in wild pursuit and ever unsatisfied longings, through time and space to reach the infinite, but in vain! But Christ has manifested the fulfilment of time, even eternity, by the power of His eternal nature. His peace is the peace of eternity, of personality merged in God and finding itself in God. In the power of that infinite superiority to time and space, which is part of His eternal nature, He threatens the storm and wind of that pantheistic excitement of the sea of life, whose wild and foaming obscurity threatens to overwhelm its disciples. And thus there is a great calm. The presence of the personal God gives to His people the assurance that they are eternal personalities, for whom the roaring flood of temporal life is to be transformed into the calm, transparent sea of His eternal administration.

2. Even Feuerbach is constrained to remark (in his essay *Das Wesen des Christenthums*), though he distorts even this truth into error, that in Christ the end of the natural world of men appeared in principle, that He, as the beginner of a new world, represented the close of the old. 'Christ, *i.e.*, the historic religious Christ, is not the centre but the end of history. This follows as much from the conception of Christ as from history. Christians expected the end of the world, of history.'—P. 204. It is just because Christ is the principle of the heavenly, and the centre of the actual, that He is the end of the natural world of men.¹

This original activity is the first and last, the primitive thesis, the ever-present and the eternal, the unchanged in the midst of change; and, for those natural philosophers who would construct nature from it, the inherent creation of the world.'—*Steffen's Alt und Neu: Beurtheilung dreier naturphilosophischer Schriften Schellings*, p. 9.

¹ [The old and recently revived question, 'utrum Christus venisset, si Adam non peccasset,' is one which philosophical theology is required to face. If we speculate at all on the connection of God with the world, on His freedom and purpose in creating, we meet the question: whether or not the world, with all its vastness and order, is worthy of the infinite Creator; whether it adequately expresses His perfections; whether there was anything in His purpose, and therefore in the essential history of the world, which can be viewed as a worthy motive of His action. Many, feeling the difficulty of asserting that a finite production is worthy of the design of an infinite God, have adopted the solution that (as Malebranche says), 'though man had never sinned, a divine Person would not have failed to unite Himself to the universe to give it an infinite dignity, so that God should receive

SECTION V.

THE IDEALITY OF THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

Christianity is in perfect harmony with the conviction that God is the perfect, the all-comprehending, the all-pervading spirit, that He is the power ruling over all life, and that He shows Himself to be this power. God is light, and not darkness, not dull matter, not a being of an unspiritual and impenetrably obscure nature; neither is there in Him a shadow of uncertainty. This conviction is a fundamental one in the conception of spirit; and by it, pure Monotheism is superior to Heathenism, Moses to Plato, Genesis to all the sacred books of Paganism. It is in the life of Christ that its verification is celebrated; for this life is the manifestation of the identity of all reality and all ideality, the marriage festival of their union. It is the manifestation of God in the flesh.

Those great contrasts in human life, spirit, and appearance, the ideal and the actual, were originally one. Hence the life of the first man rightly appears in the light of its ideality. Man, at his first appearance, was good, the pure product of God's creative energy. He lived in the visible glory of the divine goodness which surrounded him, that is, in Paradise. In this point of view, he was not yet subject to temporality, he was not as yet of a perishable nature. He felt within himself that formative process which originated the world, and divined his antecedents with childlike intuitiveness. He felt the presence of God in the gentle whispers of the airs of Paradise, the decisions of God in the impressions made upon himself by the creatures. It was thus that he received a primitive revelation from the co-operation of the objects of surrounding nature with his own sensuous and spiritual powers of anticipation, in the all-enlightening element of the omnipresent divine Spirit. This primitive revelation was, therefore, essentially identical with his primitive condition. If it be represented as special, extraordinary, and supernatural, there is an unconscious assumption of

a glory perfectly correspondent to His action.' See the question fully treated in Dörner *on the Person of Christ*, Div. II. i. 361, etc., and very lucidly by Saisset, *Modern Pantheism* i. 76, etc.—ED.]

the schism which did not as yet exist.¹ This is also the case when primitive man, in the bright dawn of his birth, comprising the beauty of the whole race, surrounded by creation celebrating his advent with joyful animation, when this man is exchanged for the savage in whom the universal curse appears in its full development, and who represents only a stunted branch of humanity.² This blessed condition, however, of primitive man was in its very nature only for a happy and pretemporal (*vorzeitlicher*) season.

Both moral and religious consciousness testify that the fall must have taken place. Man finds in his life a contradiction between his ideal duty and will, and between his sensuous, or rather his carnal, will and deed; a contradiction between his destiny and reality. Whence did this contradiction arise? By his deeming the restraint under which he was placed an evil, and fancying that he could remedy it.³ For it was by this very means that, when once the contradiction existed, he fell ever

¹ In this manner does the Apostle Paul, Gal. iii. 19, 20, treat the difference between the Mosaic and the Christian religion. In the former, angels and mediators are employed; but a mediator presupposes a schism (*ἐνός οὐκ ἔστι*). In the latter, God gives Himself to man, becomes one with him in Christ; the schism, and with it the (mere) mediator, being done away (*ὁ Θεὸς εἷς ἔστι*).

² Hegel, *Religionsphilosophie*, Pt. 3, p. 212: 'The state which has been foolishly supposed to have been the primitive one, the state of innocence, is the state of nature of the animal.' This is a merely naturalistic assertion, unable to conceive of man as a pure product of the Spirit of God, in the ideal pristine vigour of his primitive condition, because some degenerate corrupt branch of the human family is regarded as the type of primitive man. Could then the Greek, the Jew, the German, have been comprised in the savage as in the first Adam? If this original or natural existence is designated as an evil one, an Ahriman is introduced, against whom no Ormuzd could defend himself. [In conformity with Hegel's view of primitive man is the opinion of Strauss, that nothing more is required for the transition from Polytheism to Monotheism than an improved intellectual culture, and an increasing observation of the natural world. The theory of civilised man gradually developing from the savage has been thoroughly refuted by the late Archbishop Whately in a lecture entitled 'Civilisation.' —ED.]

³ They who consider the first sin necessary to the spiritual development of man, must consequently prolong the continuance of sin to eternity. This particular error is, however, connected with the more general one of viewing the determinative merely as the negative, and failing to recognise the positive in the negative.

farther and farther into the depths of opposition. The nature of the first sin may thus be inferred by the nature of the sin and sinfulness ever before our eyes. By this schism, man's standpoint with respect to the enlightenment of the eternal Spirit has been entirely displaced. In his error, he first looks upon his sin as only a natural evil; and, erring still further, he sees wrong even in natural evil. Nature now seems to him a defection from the ideal, an obscurity in God. Reality appears to him as a curse, as a judgment of God, ever plunging him into still lower depths. Thus he charges the contradiction between life and the ideal upon nature,—partly with justice, because even in nature his disturbing influence is apparent; partly with injustice, because God rules in nature, and opposes his sin in all reality. This rupture between ideality and reality, which pervades his whole soul, threatens to become an ever-increasing abyss.

But the atonement to come, had its foundation in the original relation existing between divinity and humanity, as described above. In the work of atonement is manifested the reciprocal effect of the compassion of God and the yearning of man. Hence the course of divine pity must ever be in harmony with human desire, and thus also in harmony with divine justice. It was under this condition that the great preparation for the atonement arose.

It was necessary that the atonement should take place in and through humanity, for in and through it was the union between the ideal and the actual to reappear. But it was equally necessary that it should take place in separation from and above humanity, for it could only be effected as an act of God. All ideality is on His side, and has power over all reality; but reality which appears in opposition to ideality is impotent, and without resource.

Hence the atoner, the reconciler, is on one hand the Son of man, the expression of the deepest and truest life of the human race. He belongs to it. On the other hand, He is the second man, given by God, filled with God. Hence He stands in separation from the first man, and, with him, from the whole race, as the Merciful One, the Redeemer.

This contrast appears in process of formation even in the preparation for the atonement. On one side is seen the religious man in his passivity; in his development religion appears as the

religion of nature, and under its prevalence human ruin comes to maturity, to that universal despair in which the need of redemption attains its full growth. On the other side, the religious man appears in his activity; spiritual religion is the path taken by his activity, and its climax and fruit is the God-man, the actual and true atonement.

This is the contrast between Judaism and Heathenism. God suffered the heathen to walk in their own ways, the ways of vanity, in opposition to the eternal ways of the Spirit. He withdrew from them, as they withdrew from Him. But He called Abraham and his descendants; and His call met their faith and prayer. They who misconceive this contrast, or find it inconsistent with the justice of God, who require an abstract equality in God's dealings with all nations, might as well take offence at the fact that God did not give the Iliad to the Hottentots, nor the fair hair of the ancient Germans and the Niebelungenlied to the Esquimaux.¹

This contrast, however, is only a contrast and not a contradiction; that is to say, that the salvation which came through the Jews had an inward and hidden reference to the craving for salvation which was ripening among the heathen. It was, moreover, only a limited contrast: notwithstanding the general tendencies of the heathen nations, the need of salvation was urgently felt by the majority,² and this feeling was itself a near approximation to salvation; while in the majority of the Jews,

¹ Eichhorn agrees with the Fragmentists* in refusing to recognise an immediate divine agency, at least in the Old Testament history of the world. The mythological researches of a Heyne had already so far enlarged his circle of vision as to lead him to perceive how such an influence must be either admitted or denied in the primitive histories of all people.—Strauss, *Leb. Jesu*, Pt. 1, p. 20.

² [Very interesting corroborations in detail of this whole chapter, and especially of this point, are to be found in the works of Gale, Bryant, Döllinger, Pressensé, and Ackerman, or in a still more accessible form in Trench's *Hulsean Lectures*, and summarily in Bushnell's *Nature and the Supernatural*, chap. viii.—ED.]

* ['The Fragmentists,' i.e., those who adopt the opinions broached in the Wolfenbüttel Fragments, published by Lessing in the year 1777, in the fourth number of the 'Contributions to History and Literature from the Treasures of the Ducal Library at Wolfenbüttel,' in which an anonymous writer attacked the Christian religion, and especially the history of the resurrection. Lessing disclaimed some of the sentiments there uttered—especially stating that no difference in the accounts of the resurrection could disprove the fact.—ED.]

in spite of the fact that salvation had ripened in their midst, an immense estrangement from salvation had been developed, just because they wanted to convert the contrast into a contradiction—their nation absolutely saved, other nations absolutely lost.¹ Consequently, if national developments in general are taken into account, the contrast is entirely a relative one. There is a reflection of spiritual religion in the development of natural religion, as well as a reflection of natural in spiritual religion.

Heathenism, absolutely considered, is the contrast between the ideal and the actual. But Heathenism, elevated by the feature of aspiration, and of the divine Spirit, displays a mutual interweaving of the ideal into life and of life into the ideal. An element of aspiration existed, which invested the non-historical ideal with an historical body, and the mere dull fact with an ideal splendour and a divine significance. It was thus that mythology, viewed on its bright side, was developed. For it has its dark side also, and lies under the influence of general heathen corruption. We are now, however, considering it only in its more exalted aspect. The myth-forming element, then, is in general identical with the element of aspiration after the reconciliation of the ideal and the actual, after the God-man. It is the play, the anticipation, the poetry, the dream of the christological propensity in its passivity. When, then, this aspiring poetical spirit seizes on the ideal, or the theorem to which in Heathenism the power of reality is wanting, it bestows upon them, by a gradual process of contemplation and illustration, more and more of an historic body, and forms them into facts. And thus philosophic myths arise from the element of unconscious longings for the incarnation of God, for heavenly reality.

¹ The Jewish point of view, opposed by St Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, is the same which is expressed in the question, Why should the Jews alone have been favoured with the blessing of revelation? The Jews inquired, Why should salvation come to the Gentiles, and not to the Jews alone? But we have to deal here, not with merely dogmatical assertions, but with facts which only the deluded deny. The lightning darts through the clouds in a zigzag direction, and in like manner does the spirit of revelation dart through the world. The one phenomenon arises from the extreme rarity of the lightning shown by its floating between the attracting forces, and the other from the infinite discrimination of the Spirit, who in His righteousness passes through the world with constant reference to the attraction of a felt need of salvation.

But the same spirit applies itself still more readily to such actual facts or natural phenomena as have a higher significance, explaining them according to its presentiment that all reality must be penetrated by spiritual light. Thus arise historical myths, completed by physical ones, and proceeding from a desire for the glorification of the flesh.¹ And finally, when suffering man seeks repose from his weary lot in the charms of poetry, and indulges in anticipations of a brighter and better future, he unites historical and philosophical myths into new forms, in which the whole actual world shines with divine splendour, and heaven is communicated to earth in a circle of facts. Thus do poetic myths arise.

The myth-forming era of a nation terminates as well as its infancy. But when does this take place? It may be answered, when its infancy ceases, when it begins to write, or something similar. But such answers are unsatisfactory.

When the mind of a nation begins to reflect, and to perceive the fearful depth of the abyss existing between the ideal and life, its myth-forming activity must needs be extinguished. But together with this perception, and in the same proportion, will that hitherto hidden ideal, the government of God, dawn upon it in its strict historical reality. And thus also will it learn to appreciate the spiritual actuality present in the ideals and axioms of the theory of life. Its poetry now becomes the poetry of reality, contemplating and illustrating the actual by the light of philosophical attainments, in its relation to the Eternal. The transition, however, from the mythic to the historic stage is by no means a sudden one. It is but gradually that the national mind begins to find even in human caprice, in the accidental, in the bright and the dark sides of life and of nature, and especially in the demoniacal, a more general significance, viz., its relation to the Eternal; and thus legends arise.

¹ When Eve, in her aspirations after the ideal, exclaimed at the birth of her first son, I have gotten the man, the Lord (Gen. iv. 1), the myth-forming instinct, the instinct of glorifying the actual in the ideal of the divine-human life, was strikingly displayed. The words קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֶת־יְהוָה have indeed been otherwise translated; but, in any case, they represent man in intimate inward relation to Jehovah, the Lord, and therefore man in his ideality. And this is the matter in question. Comp. *Baumgarten, theol. Kommentar zum Pentateuch*, Pt. i. p. 74.

In tradition, the ideal of general reality begins to disclose itself to man. Legends must therefore be of three kinds. Historical legends may perhaps convert the first natural philosophers into powerful magicians; philosophic legends may transform the sportive and evanescent beauties of nature into charming elves, and represent the temptations and deliverances of man as the victories of his guardian spirit over the evil spirits; while poetic legends will blend together reminiscences, for instance, of some demoniacally powerful Dr Faust, with legends of the demoniacal and Faust-like spirit in the breast of man, into a most powerful and effective poem. It is by means of the legend that man is led from that state of childhood and childlike presentiment, whose propensity it is to form myths from the historic germ of the ideal, and from the ideal germ of significant facts, to conscious life, which clearly perceives, and carries out the difference between the ideal and life, between poetry and reality, and begins to seek for the divine in things as they are.

The philosophic myth now becomes philosophy. The heathen national mind, having come to maturity, now seeks the divine in philosophy as the theory of life, and in order to find it in this abstraction, distinguishes between the school and the life, speculative spirits and ordinary individuals, and proceeds from system to system. The result is despair, for the ideal is never fully realized in life. The elect of speculative blessedness abandon the uninitiated to gloomy ignorance; one system supersedes another, and scepticism threatens to swallow up all. But despair itself brings forth the seed of the felt necessity of salvation. The logos of Plato might animate, civilise, and embellish the world, but could neither make, save, nor sanctify it. The stoicism of Zeno could sacrifice everything, but only in proud self-will, not in the love of God. The recognition of nature's subjection to law, could point Epicurus to a peace to be attained by a conduct in entire conformity with the state of life, but could not lead to rest and delight in God. These ideals formed no unity: they had no power over the life, they were not themselves manifested in the flesh; but they prepared the best of the heathen, by the deep despondency they evoked, the anticipations they inspired, and the prefigurements they taught, for the recognition of the manifestation in the flesh. Parallel also with philosophy appeared the cultivation of actual history, removing with ever in-

creasing strictness the embellishments of fiction, and seeking the ideal, the overruling providence of God, in historic reality; in the curse of civil war, as well as in the triumph of courageous patriotism; in the pestilence which raged among the people, as well as in the songs of victory which gladdened their festivals; in the silent intelligent connection and concatenation of events, as well as in the terrible judgments in which retribution is seen to march with avenging steps. But here also the result was despair,—a despair, however, which, with unconscious hope, tremblingly discerned the sublime proceedings of the Judge, and produced the fruit of a submission which cast itself upon that Judge's mercy.

The poetic myth now appeared in its metamorphosed and matured form, as classic poetry and formative art. In plastic art, the beautiful forms of gods in human shape are the most significant productions, the faint images of an incarnation of God. The Greek possessed images of special aspects or incidents of the incarnation, but not of the mere incarnation. For the image of Zeus differed from the image of Apollo, and this again from the image of Minerva, and so forth. There is no more a unity of forms in art, than there is a unity of ideals in philosophy. Nothing but a monstrous prejudice could elevate these abstractions or fragmentary ruins of the ideal, of the God-man, exhibited by the pale, cold marble images, which could but point to the divine humanity, above the more hidden, but more spiritual, the glowing, living, and real process of formation of the God-man, of Immanuel, in the prophetic life of Israel.¹ It is in heathen poetry, however, that we find the greatest abundance of christological aspirations. In epic poetry, gods, heroes, and men are mingled in the greatest variety. This is the heathen counterpart of the monotheistic ladder reaching to heaven, upon which the angels of God ascend and descend. In lyric poetry are found strains in sympathy with that repose of the human heart in the ideal, which became real, permanent, and true in Christ. But it is dramatic poetry which is most significant. It exhibits subjective human personality and action in their struggle with, and opposition to, the power of the reality which God directs and permits. In the comic drama appears

¹ See Hegel's *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion*, Pt. ii. pp. 79, 80, etc.

that meaner kind of folly which history cannot depict; it is forthwith exposed to ridicule by the power of reality, and the mirth of comedy denotes the constant sinking of the bubbles and froth of vanity in the general stream of rational and moral life. In tragic poetry we witness crime obtaining historical importance by its dark power, and continuing to entail results, until, either as the guilt of the individual, or as the hereditary guilt of the family involved in its curse, it brings about the catastrophe which requires a sacrifice, and which, viewed as a judgment of Supreme Justice, breathes of atonement. It is in Greek tragedy, then, that we meet with the deepest christological notions ever attained by the heathen world. An Iphigenia 'who must die that a Helen may be recovered;' an Antigone who sacrifices her happiness and life to redeem her brother's soul;—what significant references are these to the great centre, the real, the universal, the sufficient atonement! There is a hundred times more unconscious feeling for the truth of the Christian doctrine of the atonement, both in pure ancient tragedy, and in the nobler products of modern tragedy, than in many hypocritical rationalistic moral sermons, based as they are upon a conceited and narrow-minded dislike to the doctrine, that Christ atoned on the cross for the sins of Adam's race. But tragedy being, as classic poetry, distinct from actual life, could at best but mature the aspiration after the true atonement and the sense of its need, and increase the susceptibility for its reception.

The national development of the fall of man among the heathen nations, stood from the first in contrast with the national development of salvation among the Jews. Salvation in its formative process exhibits from the beginning an actual realization of the divine ideal of humanity, or, in other words, the idealization of humanity in its inmost actual tendencies. In discussing the call of Abraham, it is a wholly false and no longer tenable alternative, so to view the matter as to consider it a question between the actings of his own mind alone, or the supernatural acts of God alone. That harmonious contrast which exhibits the human in the divine, and the divine in the human, is more in keeping here. The EITHER and OR which would for ever separate divinity and humanity, are quite out of date in this case.

Divine as well as human is the solution throughout. It would betray a great want of appreciation of the divine-human life to be still disputing concerning Christian faith, whether it were the work of God or of man. Even in the very first germination of the christological life in the patriarchs, this ardent and inward interaction takes place. Because God seeks man, man seeks God, and *vice versa*. God calling man, and man calling on God, meet and lay hold upon each other. The God who calls, enters into covenant with the man who calls upon Him. By this covenant with Jehovah, with the ever-personal God of ever-personal beings, the life of the patriarchs begins to shine with the glory of the Ideal. The dawn of the manifestation of God in the flesh appears. The religion of Israel, as the religion of the patriarchs, or of the promise, is the counterpart of the heathen mythology. The promise is divine ideality realized, or in process of realization, in its interaction with the active aspirations of men freely yielding themselves to God. If historic myths are here sought, the seekers are corrected by the appearance of Abraham, who, in strict historical reality, is declared to be, in spite of all deficiencies, through faith, the father of the faithful. Are philosophic myths inquired after—the inquiry is met by the history of Jacob, appearing as Israel, and showing how the Ideal becomes Life: he so wrestled with the angel of the Theophany, during the darkness of the night, that he was lamed by the shock, and went halting in the daylight. Finally, are poetic myths sought—these, as well as the two former kinds, are superseded and forbidden by more real relations; in the blessing of Jacob, *e.g.*, appears a poem prophetically disclosing the very spirit and significance of his sons, and the theocratic future of his descendants.

The counterpart of heathen legends is seen among the people of Israel, in the rich significance acquired by everything emerging from this people, or even coming in contact with them. The Dead Sea, Saul among the prophets, the Edomite, and Philistine, all become symbolical when viewed in the light of the Israelitish mind.

But here also the masculine pre-Christian consciousness is characterized by its discrimination of the various references between the real and the Ideal. Heathen philosophy finds its counterpart in the law of the Hebrews. If the Ideal is mere

theory in the former, it becomes statute and practice in the latter. If it forms an esoteric school in the former, it forms an exoteric national society in the latter. If in the former it wanders from system to system, it exhibits itself in the latter in the firmest historical consistency. From the fact, indeed, that the Ideal becomes law for a whole nation, with all its rough, weak, and wild members, it seems to lose in logical pliability and pure spirituality. But the law in Israel, which was binding upon all spirits, was completed by the typical worship, which stirred, awakened, instructed, and liberated those that were receptive. All the types of this worship were, to the receptive, symbols of the eternal thoughts of God, and awoke within them ever increasing anticipations, as well as isolated perceptions and glimpses, of the nature of the atonement.

With the actual history, too, of the heathen nations, and its exhibition of tragic objective reality, is contrasted the sacred history of Israel, with its reference of all the events and leadings experienced by the people of God to His direct appointment. The history of Israel is illumined by the glory of the Ideal. The stars are in alliance with the host of the Lord. The phenomena of natural life are seen in co-operation and harmony with the antecedents and circumstances of the kingdom of God. All the great incidents even of profane history are, by their reference to the higher life in Israel, placed in relationship with the supreme and universal aim and purpose, with the manifestation of God, with the atonement. From this explanation of the ways of Israel arises that rich historical typicism, by which God's dealings with Israel—*e.g.*, their passage through the Red Sea, and their wanderings in the wilderness—typify the lot of His true people.

Finally, the noblest manifestation of spiritual life among the heathen, viz., art and poetry, finds its counterpart in Hebrew prophecy. In the former, the poet is an idealistic prophet; in the latter, the prophet is a realistic poet. In the one, we have a passive homage done to that holy thing which was in process of formation; in the other, the active formation of the object of sacred homage. In the inspired frames and utterances of the prophets are represented the incidents of the maturing and approaching incarnation of the Son of God. Poetry itself is filled with the power of reality, and reality is laid hold of, cor-

rected, cheered, and penetrated by this consecrating spirit. This struggle of humanity with divinity, and of divinity with humanity, which, with its overflowing joys and abundant sorrows, forms the distinctive characteristic of Israelitish life, terminates at last in their perfect union, in the God-man.¹ The holy Virgin, the highly favoured instrument of mature, perfect, human aspiration, conceives the God-man, the incarnation of complete salvation, and now reality becomes ideality, and ideality reality,—the true union of divinity and humanity appears.

But till this consummation, the eternal light, during the process of its breaking forth from behind the dark background of the natural national life of Israel, was surrounded by coloured rims, representing in mythological reflections the myths of the heathen world. The patriarchs had their imperfections, the law its transitory forms, the history of Israel its strange admixtures, the prophets their troubled frames of mind, and the opposition of false prophets. Hence a mythological excrescence forms as it were the setting to the development of pure theocracy in Israel, but is always separate and distinct, as a mere accompaniment, from the brightness of this development. At length, with the consummation of the ideal reality, a positive heathen product of this mythological matter is formed in Israel. Abstract myths of the New Testament era are represented by the deeds of hardened and antichristian Judaism; philosophical myths, by the Talmud; historical myths, by the homeless journeying of the wandering Jew through the world; poetic myths, by the lamentations of Israel over the mere shadow of Zion's glory, when its reality was ever more and more giving light to the world. Before endeavouring to form an estimate of the genuine ideal history of the incarnation of God in Christ in its full significance, we will try to depict the relation of the more prominent features of the world's history in the ages subsequent to the Christian era, during which the effects of Christ's life were developed, to the mythology of ancient times.

In the Christian world, history was essentially modified. It was now subjected to the ever increasing preponderance of the Ideal over the actual. The divine life now flowed, like a silent but mighty stream, through the world of men. The most wonderful, the most exalted ideals became realities; *e.g.*, the emanci-

¹ Gen. xxxii. 24, etc.

pation of slaves, the moral and intellectual equality of woman with man, the recognition of the brotherhood of nations, and their incipient alliance. But the history of the world in Christian times did not become immediately an entirely ideal history. The power of old corruptions, though it had received its death-blow, continued to manifest a fearful activity; and this still active corruption appeared in its universal prevalence even within the circle of the Church, so soon as the Church ventured to receive into its bosom, by wholesale baptisms, nations which had yet to be educated into Christian nations. But the spirit of Christianity, assured beforehand of victory, nay, animated by present victory, as the spirit of Christ, was ever contending with these masses of rude and corrupt reality. It is from these fundamental relations of the eternal Spirit to reality, that isolated analogies have arisen between Christian history and the Jewish and heathen histories, with reference to the mythological notion.

The life of the Church of Christ is in its essence divine and human, glorious, spiritually active, in other words, at once both real and ideal. Such a life flows with ever increasing power through the hidden depths of Church history; and in these depths the Christian spirit and Christian reality, as well as Christian poetry, or the celebration of life's ideal, are one. In its development, however, the life of Christ in the Church is a life in process of formation, and more or less resembles the Israelitish life. The characteristic of this formative process was seen in the fact, that Christian truths, like laws, tended to life, but had not yet become free and developed life; that Christian persons, ways, and facts, though everywhere illumined by the heavenly glory of the Ideal, were frequently plunged again into darkness; that Christian worship was still in strong contrast with work, Sundays with working days, poetry with actual life. This circle of formative Christian life, however, was itself surrounded by an extensive circle of heathen life, which the nations had in large proportions transplanted into the Christian Church. In this dark surrounding, even the light of Christianity was of necessity variously refracted, and the deepest dyes and loudest tones of the ancient mythology in consequence reappeared.—The time of Christ and of His apostles may be compared with the time of the patriarchs. Our remarks will eventually treat of this period, but are at present more immediately concerned with periods of greater histori-

cal breadth, more comprehensible, and gradually leading to the due understanding of that ideal height.

The age of the apostolic fathers and of apostolic traditions till the time of Constantine, may be compared with that age of legends which forms the transition from the mythologic to the historic period. An addition of the mythic element plays round the centre of purely Christian and spiritualized reality. In the systems of the Gnostics, the plastic impulse of Christianity appears in its strangest form. Every notion here appears as an acting person. As a semi-heathen tendency, Gnosticism recoils from acknowledging the Incarnate Word, the God-man; while as a semi-Christian tendency, it is constrained to satisfy its impulse towards the one, true God-man by the formation of a thousand idealistic phantoms of Him. And thus philosophic legends make their appearance. The historic are exhibited in the manner in which the important personages of the time are symbolically magnified: Nero, *e.g.*, into the Antichrist; Simon Magus, the spurious miracle-worker, into the counterpart of Simon Peter. Antichristian life also is drawn in darker, and Christian life in fairer colours, than the facts justify, as in the history of the martyrs. It is in the apocryphal gospels and histories of apostles, however, that the poetic legends of the period, the pious romances of this very peculiar popular life, appear. For there were but few whose primary intention, as heretical works, was actual deception.

The period from Constantine the Great to Gregory the Great, forcibly recalls that of the giving of the law to Israel. The sacred Ideal now becomes symbol, as it then became law. Religious history now becomes a history of dogmas, as then a typical history. Then, popular poetry was the celebration of symbolical promises; here, it is the commemoration of the perfected fact of redemption. The mythic element here appears in large proportions as an accessory. The Son of God of the Arians, for instance, is a philosophical myth in process of formation, gradually introducing by its development a new Polytheism. The history of the first monks, *e.g.*, of Anthony and Paul of Thebes, forms historic myths of the most beautiful and fullest significance. The tradition of this period becomes poetry, its poetry tradition, and the poetic myth is seen in the very dawn of legendary fiction.

The middle ages exhibit the New Testament people of God in their greatest extension, in their first stage of Christian development, at their nearest approach to Heathenism. All forms of spiritual life, Christian, Jewish, heathen, are here present, and the most various, the most copious intermixture of the real with the Ideal takes place: there is a continual advance of Heathenism by the law and the promise towards Christ, a continual descent of the Christian spirit upon all the steps of this widespread and various national temperament. If we inquire after the Ideal in its Christian vitality, after doctrine, Scholasticism exhibits a remarkable embodiment of all ideal Christian knowledge. Scholasticism is Christian in its essence—freedom of thought in the power of faith; Old Testament-like in its form,—its defined and statutory decisions, and in the relation of service in which it stands to ecclesiastical dogmas; and finally, mythologic, in the manner in which it converts separate notions into definite forms, and is reflected in the abhorrent astonishment of Christian people. Yet how marvellously did the enthusiasm of the Christian Ideal seize the Christian nations of the middle ages! The whole life of mediæval times becomes romantic, that is, illumined by the lightning-like glances of the Eternal, pervaded by touches of significant symbolism, through the attraction of Christian enthusiasm, in its popular, sympathetic power, and in the impulsive ardour of its youth. As the lightning at night continually illuminates the dark sky, so do the day-streaks of the Eternal fall, with ever increasing brightness, upon the dark reality. Life itself becomes poetry in this idealistic tendency. The Grecian people, in the ideal expedition of its heroic and youthful period, the expedition to Troy, obtained possession of the beautiful woman; the Jewish people, in an expedition of a similar kind, according to their temperament and tendency, conquered the promised land; the Christian nations, in their romantic expeditions, delivered the holy sepulchre. These all expressed the peculiarity of their several tendencies, temperaments, and enthusiasms, in relation to an historical phenomenon, which they recognised as their most special property, and which became to them the symbol of their whole spiritual prosperity. But when we contemplate the distinctive incidents of this idealized Christian national history, we see that in the deep cloistral seclusion of monastic life, in the middle ages, the

Christian spirit, as such, was diving with mystic ardour into the mysteries of the Gospel, and converting them into experience and knowledge; that, besides an external sacerdotal consecration, it was acquainted with the free consecration of the Spirit, in the various stages of the inner life, and was thus preparing for that happy New Testament life of faith which broke forth at the Reformation. We see, however, the same spirit in its Old Testament form, as a theocratic spirit, agitating and exciting, educating and consecrating, national life; we see it as a legal spirit, wielding the rod, or even hurling the threatening and annihilating lightning; we see it as a presentient spirit, converting all persons, customs, usages, and events into symbols of the future and eternal world. The heathen mind also everywhere takes its part in transforming Christian history into mythic phantasmagoriæ, Christian apophthegms into heathen incantations, Christian relics into heathen fetishes, Christian saints into heathen divinities. As then this Christian national life is itself romantic, the poetry and art of the period are especially so. It is not enough that these should produce their proper effect as art, they must be also symbolic and prophetic. Thus related to Christian Idealism, and illuminated by it, do we behold mediæval art seizing upon history, and consecrating it by the worship with which she is identified. This symbolic kind of poetry and art of the middle ages unites the enigmatic typicism of the Old Testament with that Christian transparency of form which allows the light of the Ideal to be seen; while, under the form of legends, it expresses, in a manner more or less mythological, the great gulf between the Christian Ideal and reality.—With the Reformation, however, Christian national life, as such, began to rise to the spiritual level of the New Testament, the specific distinction between the priesthood and the laity being, in conformity with the spirit of Christianity, abolished. The dogmas of Christianity, which had hitherto been regarded as a kind of esoteric mysteries, unfitted for and unattainable by the ordinary understanding of the Christian people, being now inculcated in a manner suited to the intellectual capacities of the flock, were transformed into powerful convictions and vital influences. On the other hand, all life, all reality, was brought to light and to judgment by the purifying glow of the Christian spirit: morals, trade, policy, war, all were thrown into the refining fire, and

only that which was pure could abide the flames, and exhibit an ideal reality. Hence, too, past history was viewed more and more in its relation to the destiny of man, and explained in its ideality as the effect of the all-prevailing government of God. And finally, poetry also became more abundant in vitality, a consecration of man's deepest sorrows, questions, hopes, and blessings; and true Christian life acquired more and more the transfiguration glory, resulting from a solemn contemplation of all worldly events in the light of Christ's victory. Thus a prospect was opened of a future, in which all Christian ideals will have the power of all availing vital forces, of custom and reality; and in which Christian national life will appear in the consecration of the spirit, in the priestly dignity of continual submission to God, and in the royal honour of free agency, in His strength. The result of this union of the divine and human life in the great extension of elect Christian national life, will be the perfected poetry of life, the longed-for rest of the people of God, called by the Mystics the seventh era, the Sabbath of the world's history.

In proportion, however, as this ideal Christian history comes to maturity, and even more speedily, is its antichristian contrast also matured, the last universal form of that false mythological manner of existence which, in the presence of apostolic Christianity, was formed in the Talmud, and in the allied features of Judaism. On one hand, it announced itself by the philosophical tendency which denied to the Ideal the power of being realized in the personality of the God-man, in the Christian Church, in its priesthood, in immortal individuals, and their salvation. On the other hand, it profaned history: moral precepts were to supplant religious revelations, mechanical inventions to eclipse moral precepts, materialistic calculations to subjugate mechanical inventions, and, finally, animal inclinations were, as a fixed principle, to govern the whole human race. One result of this depreciation of the religious and ethical view of the world, was the appearance of an absolute scepticism in all that is historically noble or holy, since the certainty of the noble and the holy can only be recognised in the element of religion and morality. Finally, the poetry of this dismemberment of the world became, in conformity with this tendency, more and more a poetry of sin and crime, the poetry which glorifies man as the demoniac animal, but blasphemes the God-man. This development points

to its termination, these appearances point to that final form wherein the ruin of mankind will be manifested in the maturity of its antichristian position. The dark side of mythology in its full development is seen here. Its hatred of the manifestation of ideal perfection in the light of Christianity, possessing as it does the illumination of that word which embraces and explains both heaven and earth, is shown in those strange caricatures and imitations of the Ideal, in those monstrous representations of the spiritual, in which the apophthegm and its contradiction, prayer and blasphemy, the features of an angel of light and the grimaces of Satan, mingling with each other, exhibit the unspeakable confusion of the Ideal. Aversion to Christian sanctity of life, as exhibited in the spiritual purity of marriage, in the spiritual consecration of property, in the spiritual elevation of the State, in the spiritual authority of the Church, which represents the bride,—this aversion has, in its delusions, so mingled the utmost profligacy with the most hypocritical monkery, the plunder of property with its dissipation, rebellion with despotic terror, and scepticism with the most abject submission to the hierarchy, that the historical presence of this sanctity can nowhere be perceived or secured in this wild confusion, but passes through the bright day like a dark myth. The poetry of so confused a state of existence can, in its very nature, be no nightingale-song, but rather resembles the croak of the three demoniacal frogs of the Apocalypse (Rev. xvi. 13), who are to appear in the last stage of the world's history, to complete the last seduction. But everywhere, even in his deepest ruin, man testifies to the indestructible tendency of his life, to realize the ideal, to idealize the real, and to celebrate this union in poetry. Even mature Antichristianity desires this union and its celebration, but not so that things should be absorbed in persons, but persons in things—not by investing substance with the light of the subject, but by plunging the subject into the obscurity of substance—not in the personal Christ, in whom all Christians are one, but in impersonal Christians, in whom the one Christ, ever divided and never complete, appears and disappears everywhere, and nowhere. Antichristianity is a caricature, a hostile imitation of Christianity, only because it wants personality, and especially the all-unifying person of Christ. All its distortions cry out for a total correction, all its perplexities for a tho-

rough solution, all its mad phrases for a healing inspiration by one word, which would make all clear, the reigning person, the God-man.

But when we behold the full, ever-spreading, ever-increasing flow of Christian divine-human life through the world, and trace this stream to its origin, shall we find it to have its rise from a source in which the ideal has not become life, nor the life ideal—in which religious passivity, as in heathen mythology, must supply its deficiencies by fictions of an atonement? The stream, on the contrary, points to a source of its own kind, to an abundant and ever-flowing fount of its own peculiar nature,—an origin, therefore, which is at once both spirit and fact, life and consecration. Christianity points back to Christ in all His historical glory.

Finally, if we follow the track of the christological formative process in the Old Covenant, and ask, To what end does it tend, what flower must this wondrous plant bear, into what fruit will it ripen?—this formative process also leads us to the appearing of Messiah, of the God-man in all His historical power and glory.

There must then necessarily exist between these pre-Christian preparations and that historical flowing forth of the divine-human life in the Christian era, such an upland as the Gospel history exhibits. The chief feature of this region is that fundamental principle of Christian life—atonement. Here, then, we see in highest religious activity that fore-ordained and perfected reality of divine life, to which heathen mythology testified in religious passivity, by significant dreams. The beautiful dream has here grown into reality; hence that faint dream of a dream, the view that the evangelical history has a mythic character, is an anachronism.

We have now reached that point of our subject which makes it our next concern to endeavour to estimate the nature of Christ Himself, with reference to the epochs of mythology. His advent as the God-man was necessary, as the result of Judaism, and as the principle of Christianity. If He had not so appeared, Judaism would be justified in its permanence; and if He were not the personal God-man, the Christian life would be but a delusion, founded as it is on the relations of believing persons to the supreme personality. He is the Son of God:

as the living unity of all the revelations of God, He appears with the power of eternity in the midst of time, and is thus also the complete realization of every divine ideal. But he is therefore also the Son of man, the living unity of all pure and elevated human life, the most intensely human being, in the light of a holy life; in other words, the perfect spiritualization of human reality. As the Son of God, He feels Himself, in virtue of His divine consciousness, to be resting in the bosom of the Father (John i. 18); and as the Son of man, He bears on His heart the whole human race, and strives to raise them with Himself into His glory (John xii. 32). Atonement is the central point of His being: in Him divinity and humanity, the spirit and nature, ideality and reality, Jews and Gentiles, heaven and earth are reunited. We may now view His life in its various relations. When we see how the Godhead is therein manifested in the flesh, in other words, the Eternal in the highest historical reality, Christ is Himself presented to us as the supreme miracle, the vital principle of each separate miracle. He enters the already existing spheres of life, as the last, the decisive, the transforming vital principle; hence He is both *the* miracle and the source of miracles, the principle of transformation and renewal to the whole Adamic race. But when we view His humanity, and see how it is one with its ideal, illuminated by the thought of God, and thus a reflection of the whole world, He appears also as the great symbol. He is in this relation the pure image of God, and therefore the light of the world; the key which unlocks the spiritual riches of heaven, of mankind, and of nature; the centre of all symbols. And because it is in Him that the Godhead first triumphs in complete victory in a human heart, and in Him that a human being first reposes on the bosom of God, on His Father's heart, and there joyfully rests and solemnly works, His life is the highest poetry. His dealings are the perfect rhythm; His word is lyric, a perpetual hymn of praise; His work the true worship of the highest festival, Himself the fairest of the children of men. And as Christ, as *the* miracle, renews the world, and as *the* symbol enlightens it; so does He, as the fairest image of God therein, also glorify it, till His Church shall appear as the bride, till both heaven and earth shall crown her with splendour as the inheritance of God.

The glory of Christ's deeds is the result of this glory of His nature.¹ As being in Himself *wonderful*, He must needs show Himself to be such, by wonder-working. Some would view Him as the God-man, without acknowledging His miracles; others will concede the miracle of the resurrection, but none other. What is this but a sun without rays—a heaven-reaching alpine peak without its surrounding wreath of Alps, and without highlands! The concession is as obscure as the negation. The incarnation of the Son of God is not His mere incorporation. In His incarnation is involved His dwelling and walking among men (John i. 14). For a man is converted into a mere apparition, if we do not grant that he must act in conformity with his intrinsic nature. This monstrous assumption is contrary also to historical truth and teleology. For never yet was a solitary power placed in the world, as a mere specimen, and then withdrawn. If it be said, that surely it is enough to allow that Christ effected very much by the power of His word, and founded an enduring Church, we would reply: must not the auspices under which His powerful word formed the Church have been miracles? Must not that effect of His word which, breaking through the outward forms of Judaism, in a few years transformed the Jewish world into the Christian world, have been accompanied by miraculous phenomena? But if it is asserted that these miracles of the Lord Jesus were, at least when compared with His teaching, but subordinate manifestations of His life, such a view is certainly not that of St John, nor in accordance with the sublimity of the Christian principle. The Christian principle presupposes that in the life of Jesus every utterance has the power of a fact, every fact or miraculous

¹ So-called 'Criticism' has committed itself to the absurdity of asserting that the leading events of the Gospel history were invented by the Evangelists. At one time, it is denied that Christ formed the Evangelists, and it is said that the general cannot be expressed in the particular; at another, the Evangelist is said to have formed his Christ, and it is asserted that the general can only be expressed by the particular. According to Jean Paul's humorous narrative, a poor schoolmaster once composed a Klopstock's Messiah and other works, according to his own idea. It was thus, perhaps, that the Evangelist composed his Messiah, or if it were not the Evangelist who embellished his Master, it must have been the Church that did so. A new doctrine indeed, according to which the needy bride clothes the rich King with the robe of righteousness.

operation the distinctness of a vocal declaration. Hence, according to St John's Gospel, our Lord often describes His word as His work; His spiritual revelations consist of the most decided effects, they are the deeds of His word, or the words of His deed; if at one time an act is the motive of His words, at another His word is the motive of His acts. Thus the words and works of Christ are, on the one hand, the separate miracles flowing from the deep fountain of His wondrous life; on the other, the separate symbols, by which the varied and abundant affluence of the eternal Spirit is announced.¹

What solemn beauty do all His deeds exhibit! A sabbath glory rests on Canaan, where they were performed; a stream of eternal peace wells forth from His most arduous conflict in Gethsemane; the accursed tree itself becomes a mark of honour when once His holy head has touched it. This remark leads us to a fresh subject, that of the circumstances by which our Lord was surrounded. We are here reminded that it is legend which first strives to look upon coarse or common reality in the light of the Ideal; that it is legend which grasps, by anticipation and invention, the spiritual significance of the actual world. But in this case fictions would be out of date. For it is a universal law that, as is the man, so is the opportunity presented to him. Supreme importance of personality demands supreme importance of surrounding circumstances. Hence the circumstances by which Christ was surrounded, acquire a peculiar and universal distinction, as being adapted to call forth the full development of His power, to occasion the whole working out of His life. They form, in their character and concatenations, a concentrated expression of the history of the world. For it was in His own

¹ According to modern criticism, traces of fiction may be recognised in the significant, the ideal. The reality of a fact is said to vanish before the illumination of the religious idea. What a reality is it, which these critics require! The more trivial and unspiritual, so much the more probable. In such a case, a witch would be more probable than a well-educated woman. And yet these histories of miracles, which at one time they consider improbable, as being symbolical, they call at another anecdotes. An anecdote, however, is nothing but a striking and amusing occurrence—the direct opposite of a myth, or of any symbolic act. Hence, first bodies without souls, *i.e.*, anecdotes, and then souls without bodies, *i.e.*, myths, but never living myths, ideal events, form the objects of their intellectual vision. The use of the word anecdote, in this connection, is specially damaging to De Wette's system.

age that Christ overcame the world and the powers of hell; it was in His own days that He found appropriate instruments for the founding of His kingdom. Thus His history was perfected by the interaction of His peculiar life with a peculiar constellation of the world's history. And it is in this way that the ideality of His life becomes an illuminating agency to the whole world; on this account, that His fate is as wonderful as His life. The fact that the theocratically-trained Jewish world and the classically-trained heathen world united with equal perversion to crucify Him, exhibits a peculiar and tragical coincidence, involving the whole ancient world in condemnation. The world's sentence, which He underwent in His death, was to be followed by His resurrection. But if the history of His life also, is rich in single and significant features, in which the course of nature corresponds with its course, this will be found in strict accordance with the parallelism, in which nature is wont to develop itself with the spirit of man. In a case wherein the whole human race is, so to speak, concentrated in one life, on the conflict and victory of which its fate depends, and wherein the conflicts of this life have so culminated that the decisive moment has arrived by which the earth as well as humanity is to be glorified, we need not be surprised at convulsions of the earth. Why must sentient nature maintain at such a moment a stoical indifference, when in less important crises she has announced, so to speak, her co-operation with that divine Spirit which was directing the world's history? But the miraculous in the history of Jesus develops also a rich symbolism, which makes the whole world transparent to its very depths. The characters by whom our Lord is surrounded, as heroes of reciprocity for His spirit—a Peter, a James, a John; the dwellings which receive Him, such as the house at Bethany; the dark or darkened beings who oppose Him—a Judas, a Caiaphas, a Pilate,—how significant do they become by their relation to Christ, and by the effect of His light, in manifesting the depths of human nature, of the world, and of hell. Yes, every man whom the Lord touched, every creature, every fleeting occurrence, becomes a living mirror, an enlightening agency to the world. His Spirit is the miraculous finger which elicits from everything its peculiar tone, everything must respond to His word. This Spirit glorifies even His cross, by revealing His victory in the resurrection. In His

sufferings on the cross is seen the reconciliation of the world, and by the light of this reconciliation a glory is shed upon all sorrow, upon all that is dark and terrible on earth, as being a dispensation of God's hidden kindness. Judgment is seen in its deep inward union with sin-annulling grace, and the world is illuminated to its very depths by the light of the divine government, glorifying itself in its victory over all evil. But it is also the same Spirit which transforms His fate into the most sublime poetical event. His life is, in its simple Gospel features, a sublime Messiad, which no poetry can surpass. It is a drama, assembling its lifelike characters in the centre of the world, and introducing, in the sharpest traits, in the most significant deeds, in the most sudden results, that catastrophe of whose all-affecting reality and result all tragic occurrences and fictions had prophesied—a catastrophe in which the curse of the Adamic race falls upon the holy child of this race, as the most terrible judgment of God upon the world, and yet a judgment which, through the infinite satisfaction of this holy sacrifice, becomes the reconciliation of the world and the means of its glorification. From the mortal agonies and heavenly victories of this history, are breathed upon every recipient soul the reviving and quickening influences of the peace of God. So real is the ideal world opened to us in the Gospel history. It is a wonderfully copious, a heavenly, a far-reaching reality, which the Philistine (Philister) beholds with alarm, and strives to represent as an obscure mythical image, in order to free himself from the powerful effect it has in disturbing his comfort. But where reality thus exhibits miracle, symbol, and poetry, in their highest unity, power, and depth, mythical representations are superseded,¹ and must vanish before the simple narratives of this reality; or, if they remain, can only be regarded as the timid apocryphal productions of popular Christianity in its immature state. Every abstract fiction must here be below the truth; and the assumption that this reality itself is such a fiction, is a pale phantom venturing to appear at mid-day.

NOTES.

1. Much discussion has of late taken place concerning the notion of myths, since the word has been so vaguely employed by

¹ See my work, *Ueber der geschichtlichen Charakter der kanon. Evang.* p. 31.

many, and lately by Strauss, in matters theological. Invention, fiction, error, fable, and anecdote have all had to play their parts in the notion of the myth. Tholuck (*die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte*, p. 51, etc.), among others, animadverts upon this confusion. Strauss subsequently expressed himself more clearly. 'We distinguish by the name of an evangelical myth, a narrative directly or indirectly referring to Jesus, which may be considered not as the expression of a fact, but as the deposit of an idea of His earliest followers. The myth, in this sense, will be met with, here as elsewhere, sometimes pure, as the substance of the narrative, sometimes as an accessory to actual history.' This whole definition rests upon a misconception of the fundamental relations existing between ideas and facts. It assumes, in the Gospel history itself, a mutilated realization of eternal ideas; and in the narrative of the Gospel history an idealistic representation of these ideas, overgrowing the reality. The idea here works in a Neptunian, not a Plutonian manner; it can form 'deposits' of facts, and 'wash away' the firmer form of tradition in its floods, but is incapable of forming primitive rocks by igneous forces, and raising a new world from the deeps. The distinction between the historical and philosophical myth is not here allowed its due importance. The philosophical appears as the *pure* myth, drawing from two sources—from Old Testament Messianic expectations, and from the impression which Christ left behind Him; the historical, as a myth *appended to history*, and having for its foundation some isolated fact, of which enthusiasm takes possession, 'in order to entwine it with mythic conceptions drawn from the idea of the Christ.' Thus the pure or philosophic myth is doubly deprived of its real elements; first of the Messianic expectation in its real tendency, then of the impression made by Christ according to its real contents; and the historical myth doubly mutilated; for, first, there is an occurrence of which enthusiasm takes possession, instead of the occurrence awakening the enthusiasm; then the myth is formed out of this occurrence, not by being further fashioned in the fire of the idea, but by being 'entwined,' as with a garland, with mythic conceptions. So antagonistic to each other are the ideal and the actual in this province of criticism. They meet like Ahrimanes and Ormuzd. The Doceticism

of a dualistic view of the universe, unable fully to grasp the mystery that the Son of God came in the flesh, here co-operates with the Ebionitism which insists upon seeing in the Christian Church an idealist far surpassing the prophet and his impression, and cannot comprehend that the flesh of Christ's life was pervaded by the Spirit, His deeds (the supposed anecdotes) illuminated by the ideal; to which, therefore, the doctrine that Jesus is the Christ is still a foreign one. Doceticism never attains to a recognition of the fulness of the Godhead in the midst of the manhood, the fulness of ideality crowned with reality. The ideal, in its flight over the earth, is only allowed to skim it like a swallow. Ebionitism, on the other hand, is incapable of recognising in the God-man, the Son of God who goes to the Father, and is raised up to the glory of the Father. According to its view, human nature only attains to the theories of the idealist—to a sort of bear's dance to the measure of the eternal, which it is unable to keep up, and soon falls heavily again upon its broad fore-feet. This swallow's flight of the ideal, this bear's dance of the actual, point to that constant schism in the world, or rather in the view of the world, entertained by the criticism in question, which may be regarded as the peculiar mark of Manichean error within the province of Christianity. The theological dictum on the notion of the myth is taken up *con amore* by Otfried Muller. Myths, says he (*Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie*, p. 59),¹ are, according to their external notion, 'narratives of the doings and destinies of individual personages, which, according to their connection and blending with each other, relate to a period antecedent to the historical era of Greece, and separated from it by a tolerably distinct boundary.' With respect to the internal notion of the myth, it is 'a mode of fusing together fact and idea' (p. 78). 'This union' (of the thing done and the thought entertained), says the author, 'takes place in most myths; and there are not

¹ [Or p. 1 of Leitch's translation, entitled 'Introduction to a Scientific System of Mythology, by C. O. Muller,' Lond. 1844. By this work a great deal of light is thrown on the subject of this chapter, and generally on the idea, sources, determination of the age, and cessation of myths. It may be well to consult also Milman's *History of Christianity*, vol. i. pp. 115 and 129; though all that he says in these chapters will not be agreed with, and must indeed be considered to some extent dangerous.—ED.]

many in which something real and something ideal may not be pointed out.—*The older the myth, the more entirely is the fact blended with the thought.* Hence, even the difference between the historic and philosophic myth, on which great stress was formerly laid, is relatively of less importance' (p. 70). It is entirely in accordance with Christian theology, that the older the myth is, the more entirely does the fact seem blended with the idea. The primitive is the type of the consummation. As, then, the highest myth in the centre of history consists in the union of the incidents of the actual, the marvellous, the symbolic or ideal, and the poetic, so must the first myth, at the beginning of pre-historic times, exhibit this union also. It is in the nature of things that here every idea should find its type in reality, and that, *vice versa*, every fact should be illuminated by its relation to the ideal. Gradually, however, a ramification takes place. The myth of Pandora, for instance, is at all events a philosophical myth; it represents the idea of the origin of evil, by an occurrence. In the recovery of the Grecian Helen from Troy, on the contrary, we have a fact embellished into a highly significant myth, in which the nation that dedicated itself to the service of beauty, began its heroic deeds in conformity with this impulse. Finally, the harmonious union of all the incidents relating to the idealized fact, forms the poetic myth. Muller does not bring this forward as a peculiar kind of myth, but discusses the notions that appertain to it under the title, 'How the myth is to be distinguished from its treatment by poets and authors.' Here the psychological motive of the occurrences, and the arrangement of various legends into one harmonious whole, is defined as the poet's share in the embellishment of a fact. Compare Ullmann's treatise, *Historisch oder Mythisch*, p. 56.

On the distinction between the myth and the legend, compare George, *Ueber Mythos und Sage*, and Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 113. Strauss defines as legendary, on one hand, the inaccuracies, on the other, the colourings, modifying such history as passes through a long course of oral tradition. These formulæ do not, however, in the least degree touch upon the real inner nature of the legend. The distinction of George would convert the historic myth into legend—myth and legend are almost one. The former is the legend of the Greeks, the latter the myth of

the Germans. If, however, the essential distinction of these notions be required, it must be acknowledged, that the myth poetically matures the scattered seed which has a religious signification, while the legend anticipatively expresses the recognition of the ideal in common, variegated, fantastic, or even terrible reality. When a misfortune consciously self-incurred is attributed to Nemesis, this is of the nature of the myth. When the shipwreck on the Lurley rocks, a mishap incurred by an unconscious fault, or by no fault at all, is ascribed to Loreley, this is of the nature of the legend.

2. In estimating the relation of the Gospel history to mythology, it must be considered, (1) as the original history of the new human race, or the real people of God, which, as such, can by no means be history in the usual sense, but only poetic, symbolic, and religious history; (2) as the commencement of a development of life, which, in conformity with its nature, is a manifestation of truth; and especially of the truth of the ideal, verified in its facts, and of the facts verified in their ideal nature. According to the notion of Christianity, it is impossible that it should be surpassed, enriched, or carried further, by any embellishments.

3. Prophecy exhibits a series of real interactions between the real and the ideal. The idea of prophecy, which many theologians had thrown away as a weed, has been brought back to them by botanists and poets, who have begun to recognise, even in the life of plants, the nature of prophecy. Göthe's poem *Die Metamorphosen der Pflanzen* is, in this respect, very significant. All those phenomena of natural life, which not only externally announce, but also internally prepare a higher development, as, *e.g.*, the leaf does the flower, present an image of prophecy.

The myth, on the contrary, has its type in the various allusions, or lights and shadows, in which nature is so abundant. Thus the moon, for example, upon whose dark but real body is impressed, so to speak, the image of the sun's brightness, the ideal of its nature, seems to be an image of the historical myth. The dawn, on the other hand, denotes the philosophical myth: we have here the young day which, before its appearance in the world, forms in the clouds of heaven a beautiful but unsubstantial corporeity. The rainbow represents figuratively the original

unity of the two kinds of myths; the primitive myth, for the cloud representing obscure reality is illumined by the light, but the light, denoting the colourless ideal, developes all its variegated splendour in its union with this reality. Finally, the reflection of the heavens in a clear stream seems a natural emblem of the poetic myth. As the bright images of the sun and moon appear in the watery mirror, fulfilling the saying, '*Kehrt wellenathmend ihr Gesicht nicht doppelt schöner her?*' so do the pure reflections of ideal history, or of the mythically incorporated ideal, appear with enhanced splendour in the element of poetry.

SECTION VI.

THE EFFECT OF THE IDEAL HISTORY: THE SACRED REMEMBRANCE.

Great characters manifest themselves by great exhibitions of their power. These exhibitions are confirmed by the great impressions they produce within the sphere of their operation. These impressions, finally, continue in the abundant, clear, and powerful reminiscences of those, whose minds were affected by them. The stronger the impression a man has received, the greater will be the power with which it will, during his whole life, prevail over all weaker impressions and remembrances. The more general this impression is, and the greater the number of the minds who share it, the longer will its memory survive, both in the private intercourse and public announcements of a community. But if the impression be a religious, a practical, a vital one, it must of necessity be exhibited in the life of the community, whose very spiritual being stands in constant interaction with this its remembrance. In proportion, finally, as this impression is consolatory and elevating, will the memorial, in which it resounds through the world, and through time, be a sacred one. It was consequently inevitable, that the effect of the life of Jesus should be impressed and perpetuated, in a sacred memorial, upon the life, and within the circle of His followers, by means of the Gospel history; for the most power-

ful effect which mankind ever experienced, lay in the exhibition of His divine-human life, by which the glory of God was fully manifested in the midst of mankind. Hence the remembrance of Him and of His history is the predominating historical thought of the human race, and surpasses all other human remembrances. The effect of Christ's life has, from the very first, affected through its divine power the whole human race, by means of that agitation which it produced among His immediate followers. It is an effect still propagated by means of the members of His Church, and one which will never cease till it has penetrated the whole body of humanity. As a religious influence, however, or rather as *the* religious influence, proceeding as it does from perfect religion, it constitutes a church, whose spiritual life is identical with its remembrance. The highest solemnity of the Christian life, *e.g.*, is the showing forth of the death and victory of Christ in the Lord's Supper. If then we contemplate the matter of the Gospel history in the impression it has left on Christian life, in the assurance of the manifestation of God, of the atonement, of victory over death, and of the heavenly glory of Christ and His people, the conclusion is irresistible, that in this definite and full memorial of the Christian Church we behold a sacred memorial to all mankind of the great days and great facts of their reunion with God. The effect of Christ's life and deeds may be regarded generally as the greatest shock ever experienced by mankind.¹ As such it naturally commanded the attention even of the enemies of Christ, and of those who unconsciously experienced its agency in their very enmity. His enemies could not free themselves from the remembrance of Him, though they deformed it into a caricature, through the false medium of their self-delusion, as they had before experienced only exasperation and delusion through their perversion of His agency. The watchful and zealous hatred which, according to the Acts of the Apostles, was ever excited by the announcement of Christ's death and resur-

¹ [See an eloquent passage in Ewald's *Geschichte Christus' und seiner Zeit*. Pref. xi. (Ed. 1857). 'For all time,' he says, 'this divine-human life has become the most brilliant light; and who can still love error, who can hang his head and doubt, if once he has opened his eyes in this light? In what time, in what condition, in what breast does not this inextinguishable light shine?'—Ed.]

rection, bears witness to this. The Roman power, whose representative, Pontius Pilate, had, in his weak and false hesitation, suffered himself to be seduced to the execution of the Jewish designs against Jesus, received by this execution its first impulse to an inimical disposition towards Christ. It was in the sphere of this inimical disposition, that the accounts propagated by Tacitus and Suetonius¹ concerning Christ were formed. Even in the high places of Roman life, the spirits of the day very soon received a faint impression of that great spiritual conflict and victory, whose effects were from henceforth to agitate the world.

This inimical representation of the agency of Christ, expressed in obscure traditions concerning Him, was surrounded by a more general sphere of indefinite astonishment at the spiritual power He displayed. Under such an impression did Josephus write of Christ.²

But within the circle of the recipient minds of the elect, the impression left by Christ's personality was a bright and blessed one, condemning the old life of sin, and implanting the new life of love and righteousness. Here, then, the remembrance of Christ was a continual festival. In this form it must, according to its very nature, so outweigh and outlast, illuminate and purify, all the other remembrances of believers, and bring them into inward connection with itself, as to become the enlightening and penetrating principle of all those other remembrances. How could it indeed fail to become the principle of all the remembrances of Christians, when it became the principle of their whole Christian life?

The historical word, by which the Gospel narrative has been handed down to us, corresponds with the historical power of the Gospel life. These two aspects of Christ's continual operation are fundamentally identical. Consequently, the Church may either be regarded as a lasting and real remembrance of Him, or as the continuous operation of His life. As the moon, though a thousand times more distant, is nearer to our room than the lamp in a neighbour's house, because its effect is a thousand times more powerful, and as the sun again is infinitely nearer than the moon, though with respect to space only, it

¹ Tacitus, *Ann.* xv. 44 ; Suetonius, *vita Claud.* c. 25.

² Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. 3, 3.

again is situated at an immensely greater distance,¹ so is Christ, though so far removed from us as to His glorified body by the external relations of space, infinitely nearer to us by the power of His operation than any man in our immediate neighbourhood; nay, He is with us, and through faith He is in us, by the power of this His operation. These are the ideal relations of space. So also the geography of the spirit and of love has very different estimates of nearness and distance on earth from the geography of mathematical science. And that which is here said of space, is equally applicable to time. According to the Christology of space, Christ is said to be here, in virtue of the effect He produces, just as the sun is said, in virtue of what it effects, to be in and on the earth. According to the Christology of time, or according to the chronology of the Christian mind, the Church, when celebrating the remembrance of the Lord, and proclaiming it to others, rightly says, 'He was but just now here, and He will soon come again: He comes quickly.' The Christology of time is not understood by those² who say that the apostles were misled by an enthusiastic excitement, in their announcements that the Lord's coming was at hand. They were but giving expression to that elevation of feeling, wherewith the mature Christian, as an heir of God and of eternity, looks upon time, so that to him, as to his God, according to the measure of his spirituality, a thousand years are as one day. In this respect, the highest conception of time may be explained by a still

¹ Distant as the sun may be from our eyes, so soon as it is perceived, it is, by means of the rays proceeding from it, immediately in our eye. There is between the seeing eye, as such, and the seen sun, as such, no space which can hinder the vision and consequent enjoyment of the sun; the beam brings it as near as is necessary for the eye to see it, without injury. All that we can enjoy of the sun comes to us in its beams; by its beams all space between us and it is as good as annihilated. Thus do I, by means of a sensible image, form a conception of the agency of Christ, while He is at a distance from me, and personally visible and present in some one of the heavens.—See Lavater's *Jesus Christus stets dasselbe*, p. 31.

² [In the last instance by Renan (*Vie de Jesus*, p. 275): 'Que tout cela fut pris à la lettre par les disciples et par le maître lui-même à certains moments, c'est ce qui éclate dans les écrits du temps avec une évidence absolue. Si la première génération chrétienne a une croyance profonde et constante, c'est que le monde est sur le point de finir,' etc. What Jowett has to say on this 'error of the apostles' may be seen in his *Epistles of St Paul*, i. p. 120. —ED.]

higher. The glorious entry of Luther into Worms is fresher and nearer to us, than the more modern disputes of Lutheran theologians; and Hermann the Cheruscan seems but just now to have led the Germans to victory over Rome, while the last trial for witchcraft seems already quite ancient history. But the memory of Christ, of His death and victory, surpasses all other human remembrances in ever youthful freshness. The ever-enduring Church of Christ, is His ever-enduring memorial.

But we have here more especially in view that remembrance of Him still living in the historic word, which must have originated in the apostolic Church. This remembrance must of necessity be proportionate to the unique effect produced by Christ's life, and therefore infinitely profound and powerful, fully developed and definite, and, in its totality or completeness, blessed and sacred. The men whom Christ had apprehended, might forget everything else; but Him, His work, His deeds, His sufferings, the manifestations of His glory, they could not forget. The Spirit of Christ, poured out upon them at the conclusion of His work, was the unifying principle which connected all their remembrances, the vital element which renewed and preserved them. They must have felt themselves impelled by the mighty effect Christ's life had upon them, to be ever recalling to each others' memories, and proclaiming to the world, the great facts upon which it rested. Their life was blended with the Gospel history; their reconciliation to God and their salvation were identified with it; hence the glorious treasure of their Gospel reminiscences could not possibly fade. They saw in the life of the Lord Jesus the supreme miracle which had brought deliverance to the world: its facts, therefore, must have been continually filling them with silent, deep, and glorious emotion. 'It was about the tenth hour,' says John, when relating his first meeting with Jesus (John i. 39). He could no more forget the hour, than a mother could forget that, wherein her child had been born into the world. Mary kept all the sayings which glorified her Saviour-Son, in her heart. 'We cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard,' declared the apostles, before the Sanhedrim. No man can be hindered from proclaiming those great, most certain, and most glorious experiences, in which his own spiritual life originated, and by which it has

continued to grow.¹ Hence the preaching of the apostles was a giving vent to those words of joy which gushed forth from the abundance of their own animated reminiscences. It has of late been asserted, that the apostles did not set forth the Gospel history, but only announced the dogmas of Christianity. Evangelical metaphysics perhaps? But the very first dogma of Christianity—the Word was made flesh—is also an historical fact. And therefore the sublimity and vigour of apostolic teaching consisted in the fact, that they proclaimed the word of Christ in its living union with facts; or, in other words, that the facts of His life, and especially of His death and resurrection, were set forth in the ideality of His word; these being the two parts of the living unity, in which this teaching was delivered to our faith. Certainly these two great facts, the death and resurrection of Christ, formed the key-note of apostolic testimony. But could the death of Christ have obtained its own special importance to their hearers, if they had not also depicted the chief features of His life? And could they have represented His resurrection as a certain fact, if they had not also narrated His subsequent appearances? It is certain that the Evangelists made it a part of their task to hand down copious details of this kind. Whence, then, should they have derived their materials, if not from the communications of the witnesses who held immediate intercourse with the Lord? These witnesses were the living Gospel; the Church, with which the most copious, the clearest, and brightest reminiscences of Jesus were as entirely one, as the scent of a fresh-blown rose is one with the rose.

Those writers who, in our days, are beginning to deny all certainty and trustworthiness to apostolic tradition with respect to the life of Jesus, seem to have lived so long in the region of modern literature and periodicals, where one wave so quickly swallows up another, where the latest novelty so rapidly fades before another, and where one point of view is so hastily abandoned for another, as to have gradually lost the power of forming a clear conception of the fervour, uniqueness, and power of the apostolic memory. As children of time, serving the temporal god, the process-god, with a memory revolving in constant

¹ No Christian can be forbidden to bear testimony to his own blessedness in fellowship with Christ; this inalienable right makes him truly a preacher, as the right of hearty intercession makes him truly a priest.

change of impressions, about the feverish unrest of an unstable heart, they are the very antipodes to those happy men who, living by the power of Christ's Spirit with Him in His eternity, preserved in the tranquil depths and fervent emotions of their hearts, and in constant sabbatic peace, the most divine and solemn remembrance of His life, His death, and His glorification ; in whose inner life the facts of the New Testament ever continued novelties, retaining the original brilliancy of blooming flowers, of molten silver, or of the eternal thoughts of God. In our days of worldliness and newspapers, the contents of the memory are ever more and more perplexed and saddened by the unrest of the heart ; while the great experiences and remembrances of the apostolic Church maintained their imperishable brightness and beauty, because they were founded upon a heart-life penetrating to the depths of eternity, reposing on God, filled with all the fulness of Christ.

NOTE.

While we may agree with Hug (*Einleit. ins N. T.*), that the apostles did not perhaps in public assemblies so recount the history of Christ's life according to its circumstances and sequence, that their statements could have been formed into historical books ; it does not follow that in their instruction, 'so far as it was merely historical,' they limited themselves 'to the sufferings of the Lord, His death, and that pillar of their doctrine, His resurrection.' When Weisse appeals, in support of this view (*die ev. Gesch.* p. 21, etc.), to the small amount of Gospel narrative contained in the apostolic Epistles, the great difference between the oral agency of the apostles, by which they founded churches, and the written agency, by which they built them up, is not sufficiently borne in mind.¹

¹ [The whole of the third chapter of Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* should be consulted on this point, and especially the remarks on the form of the apostolic preaching, p. 158.—ED.]

PART II.

THE MORE GENERAL RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF THE LORD JESUS.

SECTION I.

GENERAL SURVEY.

THE special historical records of the life of Jesus are the four Gospels. They form the centre of all evangelical testimony to Jesus, and exhibit the direct impression made by His wondrous personality in the sphere of literary composition. But this centre was no isolated phenomenon. The contents of the Gospels are assumed, required, and supported by the whole of the New Testament, and especially by the Acts of the Apostles, just as the historical books of the Old Testament are assumed by the contents of the Psalms and the Prophets. Roses and lilies do not grow rootless out of the earth: as little does the testimony of the theocratically inspired life of the Old Testament, or the life of Christ in the New Testament. The whole New Testament, however, may again be looked upon as only the conclusion and climax of a more general organism, namely, of the Holy Scripture. The Old Testament does not contain its conclusion within itself. They who would separate the New Testament from the Old, have this enigma to solve, how it happened that the robust oak thus suddenly stopped short in the midst of its growth, why it terminated in a gnarled stump, instead of attaining its appropriate leafy crown. The essential contents of the Bible are accredited by the two greatest religious phenomena which ever appeared, and which have endured to the present day, viz., Christianity and Judaism. That line of theocratic Monotheism which forms the key-note in the history of the

religious life of all mankind, leads, both by its bright side, Christianity, and its reverse side, Talmudism, to the high region of biblical facts and institutions. But it is not so easy to infer the nature of the former blossom from the broken shell of the fruit, as from the fruit itself. The Christian Church, as the fruit of that wondrous blossom, the facts and teachings of the Bible, is a great and lasting testimony to their truth. As in the vegetable world, the kingdom of the flowering plants rests upon that of the leafy, so is it itself again the bright circle supported by the darker ground of the general religious consciousness of mankind. It is not possible to imagine the present world deprived of the Christian Church, without regarding it as maimed, deprived of its powers of development, and orphaned. Thus the four Gospels form the centre of a series of spheres indissolubly linked with each other. If the jewel is torn out of a brilliant ring, the setting becomes worthless and unmeaning; and it is thus with the Gospel history, with regard to its setting. Since, however, the life of the Lord Jesus is thus connected with those more general circles of life which concentrically surround it, it must have left a more or less distinct impression on all these enclosing circles. And they may thus all be called records of the life of Jesus. The order, then, of the general records of the life of Jesus appears to be as follows: (1.) The New Testament; (2.) the Old Testament; (3.) the theocracy, especially the Christian Church; (4.) the religious life of the human race.

NOTE.

The bright side of the history of mankind stands fundamentally in the closest connection with the glorious history of the Gospel, while even its dark side points towards it; and when once the scientific knowledge of that great organism, humanity, is as mature as the knowledge of animal organisms, an organic prophecy, pointing to the Gospel history, will at length be discovered in every greater fragment of history. Thus, *e.g.*, cannibals, as representing the deepest degradation of humanity, furnish a significant hint of the compass of the human gamut. As the depth of the water on a rock-bound coast represents with tolerable accuracy the height of the overhanging precipices, so do those depths of degradation point upwards past

the middle regions of civilisation, to a heavenly perfection of humanity. In a narrower sphere, the same inference may be made of Israel's crowning point, from Israel's degradation. Many important nations have a far less extended scale of spiritual variation than the most important: the former are of average talent; the latter exhibit, as it were, hills and valleys in giant-like masses, as, *e.g.*, the German nation. The Israelitish nation is, so to speak, a nation with two rows of keys. This applies in a higher degree to mankind in general.

SECTION II.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The history of the life of Jesus is accredited, in its leading features, not only by the four Gospels, but by the whole New Testament. The book of the Acts of the Apostles continues the history of Christianity in the same tone, and in the same spirit, in which the Gospels relate the history of Christ. The three chief incidents of His life, the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension, it distinctly brings forward. The disciples of the Gospels here figure as apostles; but even in their new condition, their individual characters are quite in accordance with the characteristics attributed to them in the Gospels, and the most significant are conspicuous. The miracles of Jesus are repeated in the miracles of His disciples, even to the greatest, the raising of the dead. But even from the apostolic Epistles and the Apocalypse, we obtain a distinct impression of the life of Jesus,—an impression, moreover, which is enriched with many special features. According to the teaching of these apostolic writings, Christ was the Son of David according to the flesh (Rom. i. 3, 4), the second man, the Lord from heaven, a quickening spirit (1 Cor. xv. 45–47), born of a woman (Gal. iv. 4). His teaching is unfolded in the teaching of the apostles (1 Cor. ii.), His miracles, in the miraculous gifts of the primitive Church (1 Cor. xii.), His great conflict with the carnal mind of His people, in the experience of His witnesses (2 Cor. ii. 15, etc.), the institution of the Lord's Supper in St Paul's

description of the same (1 Cor. xi.); while His crucifixion and resurrection form the all-pervading elements of the apostolic Epistles, as being the most essential incidents of His life, of Gospel preaching, and of Christian experience. The form of Christ is thus apparent in the apostolic writings; and they who would oppose the essential features of the Gospel narrative, have to deal not with the four Gospels only, but with the whole New Testament. Even the Epistles of the New Testament are Gospels.

NOTE.

In his essay, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte*, p. 372, etc., Tholuck, with reference to Strauss's criticism of the life of Jesus, expresses himself, concerning the relation of the representation of the life of Jesus in the four Gospels to its representation in the New Testament in general, in the following words: 'In passing from the Gospels to the Acts we might have expected to find no more mention of miracles. We do not, however, meet with so abrupt a cessation, but find, on the contrary, that the Acts and apostolic Epistles, together with the Gospel narratives, form one continuous series, and that, a continuous series of the miraculous. Christ is not depicted like the sun in tropical countries, which rises without a dawn and sets without a twilight; but as a thousand years of prophecy preceded Him, so do miracles follow Him, and the forces which He first evoked continue to work for a time, with greater or less activity. Hence, if criticism would banish the sun from the world, it has still to deal with the dawn and the twilight.' The forces which Christ evoked do not, indeed, continue their activity only 'for a time,' but till the end of the world, and beyond it. It was, however, for a time that they maintained the first form of their activity, a form breaking violently through the old life, and therefore miraculous.¹

¹ [The argument to be drawn from the identity of the representations of Christ in the Gospels and in the remaining books of the New Testament, has been elaborated with his usual delicacy and richness of treatment, and urged with remarkable skill against negative criticism, by Isaac Taylor in his *Restoration of Belief*, Cambridge 1855. And for the cessation of miraculous powers see (not Bushnell, nor even Pascal, but) the very judicious remarks in Burton's *Lectures on the Eccles. Hist. of the First Three Centuries*, vol. ii. pp. 5 and 230.—ED.]

SECTION III.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The picture which the scriptures of the Old Testament furnish of the Messiah, is drawn with great clearness and boldness. Though single features only are given in the several delineations, yet are these all founded on, and developed from the same general view. In the Old Testament scriptures Christ is the end of the divine promise, and the object of human desire. The older theology delighted to find Him in the more obscure passages of the Old Testament writings, *e.g.*, in the plural form, 'Let *us* make man' (Gen. i. 26), in the 'sight of the Lord' (Deut. iv. 37), in 'the angel of the covenant' (Mal. iii. 1), and similar passages. Modern rational theology, however, would scarcely any longer admit the existence of an expectation of a Messiah, and especially of a suffering Messiah, in the Old Testament, until suddenly the wind veered round to another quarter, and then it was said that Christ was in the Old Testament, but scarcely a shadow of Him in the New; that the Christian Church had derived the miraculous element contained in her representation of her founder from the Old Testament delineations of the Messiah. Thus were the stem and flower alternately denied, while the fact was lost sight of, that history is as little accustomed as nature to exhibit such monstrous instances of incompleteness. But when once a clear notion of the nature of the Christ of the Old Testament is arrived at, a real fulfilment of the expectation there held out will be demanded. The coming of Messiah is involved in that constant reaching forth to things to come, which is the very spirit of the Old Covenant. This covenant not merely exhibits the contrast between the divine and the human, but also that interaction of both, that approach, that mutual grasp, the consummation of which was to be their real union in the God-man. The patriarchal promise advances from the promise of the blessing to the promise of the individual who was to bring the blessing, *the Prophet*; while even the law, much as it appears to deal chiefly with the outward letter, is founded upon the idea of human nature as it ought to be, and therefore upon the God-man. Typicism sets forth, in shadowy form, not only the work of atonement, but

also the Atoner Himself; the official anointing designates each aspect of Christ's life, His prophetic, priestly, and kingly nature; and from the descriptions of the Messiah in the Old Testament, especially in the writings of the prophets, may be gathered a full delineation of Himself. The same spirit, *e.g.*, which reproves the zealous Elijah (1 Kings xix. 10, etc.), appears in the declaration wherewith Christ rebukes the zealous disciples (Luke ix. 55). When we find ideal traits of such peculiarity and delicacy, from the Old Testament, incarnate in the life of Christ, we can no longer feel surprised at the New Testament incarnation of the more general features of the Old Testament revelation. Christ's birth by the Spirit, His holy life, gentleness, fearful conflict, bitter sufferings, death, victory, and glory; the reconciliation, renewal, and transformation of the world; these are those broad features of the Messiah, in which the New Testament is one with the Old, the fulfilment with the hope. Yes, we find in the prophets, as in all the sacred scriptures, the blossoms of the real incarnation of God, afterwards to ripen into the perfect fruit. No impersonal Messiah, no merely general idea of the perfectibility of man, could follow the Isaiah of actual history. If we could imagine the New Testament lost for a time, a theological Cuvier would be able to infer its existence and general nature from the peculiarities of the Old. Such scientific diviners were the prophets. From the great ones of former times, from Abraham, Moses, and David, they could infer the coming glory of Christ. It is a contradictory and unhistorical procedure, arising from the want of a sense for the organic, both in nature and history, to make an unchristian Old Testament precede the Christianity of the New, or a mythological New Testament follow the christological Old Testament. An assumption of so monstrous a kind is in its very nature a mutilated romance, a necessary development from the pantheistic notion of the universe; while, on the other hand, the recognition of the organic connection between the Old and New Testaments, is the result of the recognition of an eternal, personal God, and consequently of Jehovah, the God presiding with consistent freedom over all history.

NOTES.

1. It is only in their mutual connection that either the Old or the New Testament can be thoroughly understood. The Talmudist separates the New Testament from the Old, as a false excrescence, and idolizes the Old exclusively, teaching that it has always been in the bosom of God. Thus the living God, ever cherishing the Son in His inmost nature, becomes to him but a kind of grey-bearded rabbi, employed, in the eternity before the world, in drawing up the holy book, the Thorah. (Compare *De Wette, Einl. in das Alte Testament*, p. 19.) The antipodes of the Talmudists, in their view of the canon, are the ancient and modern Gnostics, who thought to purify and elevate the New Testament by separating it from the Old, and denying the identity of the God of the New with the Jehovah of the Old Testament. The ancient Gnostics could not appreciate the Old Testament, because they were infected with the dualistic view of the universe, which regarded matter as evil. In this respect, the pure ideality in which the Old Testament represents creation, as the product of the Word of God, was abhorrent to them, as were also all its consequents, especially the real incarnation of the Son of God. It is by the same error that the modern Gnostics are led into misconceptions of the Old Testament. In the fact that they explain sin as a result of finity, and see in individual definiteness only the limitation of the spirit, we recognise the old dualism in its subtlest form and most virulent distinctness. The New Testament God, however, of whom they form conceptions in such contrast with the eternal Jehovah, is in reality the impersonal, evanescent phantom of religious sentimentality, cherishing within himself the evanescent universe, a counterpart to the rigid rabbi with his ever rigid Thorah in his bosom. According to the Talmudists, the Son of God is a perpetual law-book; according to the Gnostics, a continuous metamorphosis of the world. The latter are entirely ignorant of the simple law, that the God of revelation, for the very reason that He is ever the same, must assume a varying form in presence of the varying degrees in which the religious consciousness is developed. The same human father, of whom the boy of ten years old said, How unkind my father is! appears to the matured young man of twenty, a father who, even in his chastisements, was but

maintaining the discipline of love. The more modern enemies of the Old Testament have especially set themselves against the circumstance of thunder being ascribed to Jehovah, overlooking the fact that thunder is always an actual fact; that it is quite natural to ascribe this phenomenon to the all-effecting God; and that, finally, it is only the difference between regarding thunder as sent by God with intentional reference to some event, or as sent by Him without such intentional reference.

2. The Christology of the Old Testament has hitherto suffered from many deficiencies. First, it has chiefly or exclusively sought the christological element in significant particulars, instead of recognising it in the entire development of Old Testament life. Secondly, it has not duly estimated the process of formation of the New Testament or christological life in the Old Testament, nor its gradual progress, nor, consequently, its organization. But, thirdly, it has been specially forgotten that this process of formation is not a merely figurative one, exhibiting the dogmatic image of Christ, but, at the same time, a substantial one, consummated in the actual God-man. In the latter respect Christology has been much injured by Nestorian views, which have not duly estimated the manner in which the life of Christ Himself was gradually introduced by the consecrations of the lives of many, found in the line of the Old Testament genealogy of Mary. Misconceptions of the relation of the Old Testament to the New, have been entertained in modern times especially by Schleiermacher (see his *Glaubenslehre*, vol. ii. p. 346, and other places) and Hegel (see his *Religions-Philosophie*, vol. ii.).

SECTION IV.

THE THEOCRACY, ESPECIALLY THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

In viewing the theocracy as the historical development of the kingdom of God, it may be regarded under three principal forms. First, it appears in the growth of its peculiar life, as this advances towards full maturity. This maturity is manifested

by the circumstance of the ripened fruit of the sacred organism bursting its decaying shell, and wholly freeing itself from it. The sacred plant is the Old Testament Church; the shell, Talmudism; the fruit, the Christian Church. The Messiah being then indisputably the central point of the theocracy, these three forms of religious life must of necessity all point, by decided christological indications, to the history of Christ's life. In fact, the preliminaries of this history appear even in such particulars as the Old Testament assumes. The first fundamental law of Old Testament history is this, that the kingdom of God is founded by distinguished and chosen individuals. It is to such individuals that the Lord says, 'I give people for thy life' (Isa. xliii. 4). The theocracy does not reckon the greatness of humanity by heaping numbers upon numbers, nor by the combination of 'millions of perukes or socks.' It is not the ant-hill in which undistinguished equality prevails, but the bee-hive in which all is done with reference to a mystically governing queen, which is the type of the theocratic ideal of human nature.—The second characteristic of the theocracy is, that it regards history from the point of view afforded by its unity, whether that unity is considered with respect to its extension in the contemporary history of various nations, or its duration during periods. Much has been said concerning the isolation of Israel in the Old Testament; but it must not be ignored, that this isolation is the struggle of the morbid Monotheistic spirit of Israel with the polytheistic nations—a struggle decidedly demanding and announcing the union of other nations with Israel, while the heathen nations, in spite of all their intermingling, pursued their several courses side by side, without any feeling that they were destined for union. This theocratic view of the unity of history points towards the point of union.—Thirdly, the theocracy had a deep conviction of being an organism, the purpose of whose development it was to exhibit the formation of true religion and its progress towards perfection. The prophets are full of distinctions between the various gradations of religious life under the Old Testament, and their special vocation is the announcement of its consummation, the manifestation of the kingdom of God in and through the God-man.—Finally, the theocracy also lays great stress upon the ironical contrast in which the arrangements of the divine economy stand to the assumptions of ordinary

worldly understanding. God, for example, chooses the little to represent the eternal; the mean, despised nation of the Jews becomes the instrument of revelation; the obscure country of Palestine, and of this country the poor province of Galilee, and of this province the despised town of Nazareth, is the theatre of its highest miracles. A worldling would certainly not have chosen 'a corner in Galilee' for the manifestation of such things, but rather the great Mongolian steppe, where the 'specimens of the genus' manage their horses in countless troops. This fundamental principle of the theocracy, the manifestation of the great in the little, leads the religious sense upon the track of the Nazarene, the Crucified. Even Talmudism, that decayed husk of the theocratic life, the obverse of the history of the New Testament kingdom of God, is forced to bear testimony, by distinct allusions, to the history of Christ. The still prevailing expectation of a personal Messiah is the soul which holds together, keeps on its feet, and drives through the world, the dry skeleton of the wandering Jew. The power of the stumbling-stone may be inferred from the force with which it has hurled the unhappy nation through all the world, and crushed and scattered its members. The fate of the Jewish people bears the impress of the tremendous conflict they have waged against their destiny, their guilty resistance of their vocation, and the glory of this vocation. Thus their fate also leads us to infer the fulness and holiness of that manifestation of God in actual history, at which they stumbled, and against which they fell. Finally, the dead formalism of Talmudism finds its counterpart in the Christian festival of Whitsuntide, and in the Christian Church. The Church, however, is the expanded Gospel, because it bears the life of Christ within itself. All its vital powers are one in their nature, and point, in this oneness, to the oneness of their source, the *one* perfect personality of the God-man. They are also all ideally real, whenever their nature as matured powers is fully manifested; and as such they cannot be the product of an idealistic-imaginative school, but must be the result of a perfect, potent, ideally-real life, perpetuated in the establishment of a Church. These vital powers have, moreover, been overgrown by certain particulars of merely ecclesiastical remembrance; yet even under this form they point to as many particulars of Gospel history. In the glorification of the blessed

Virgin, *e.g.*, is contained a perpetual announcement of the miraculous birth of Christ. The great incidents of the life of Christ, moreover, appear in the festivals, dogmas, and vital powers of the Church. How decidedly does the Church's joy in the midst of affliction, her glorying in the cross, point to the death of Christ, its influence and glorious results! Can the perpetual testimony of the Christian Church to the resurrection and ascension of Christ, in its assurance of victory over death, in its hope of the glory of the future life, be mistaken? When we consider, further, the divine vital forces of the Church, in their opposition to the fashion and notions of the world, we are constrained to wonder at the might of that spiritual irruption, with which they burst forth from their fountain to conquer the opposition of the ancient world, and are consequently led to the conclusion, that they could only have become matters of history through a series of miracles; just as a lofty mountain stream can only fight its appointed course through a country by means of a series of waterfalls. Thus do even our institutions for the blind, our hospitals, and asylums point to that glorious chaplet of miracles by which Christ was surrounded in the energizing effect of His miraculous life. Finally, all may be summed up in the one remark, that the life of the Church of Christ is a manifestation of the presence of the Holy Ghost. This presence of the Spirit of God, however, as the Holy Spirit, assumes the perfection of the Gospel life in its fulness, its totality, its infinite depth, and pure reality. An idealistic, immature religious life, a life terminating in the bud and never advancing beyond its first beginnings, might announce the presence of the Spirit of God, but the Spirit is not manifested as the Holy Spirit, till the manifestation of the Son is perfected. How could the return of the Son to the Father take place, before His coming from the Father into the world was perfected? Not till the manifestation of the Son was completed, could that free life, with which all the incidents of His life are identified, flow forth to sanctify the Church, that is, to lead her back with the Son out of the world into union with God. Thus the Church, as the stream of divine life, testifies of its sublime source, the life of Jesus (John vii. 39).

NOTES.

1. The separation which exists between Israel and other nations, expresses its inward relation to those nations, in the same manner as the separation of the Christian Church from her excommunicated members, expresses her suffering for them, and her desire for reunion with them in the communion of Christ. And as, in our days, a spirit of moral slumber makes men find more humanity in the rude, natural intercourse of the heathen nations, than in that separation between Israel and the world, so also do they find more Christianity in the moral laxity of the Church, than in her exhibition of social Christian decision. The notion of discipline seems as alarming as though the very alphabet of the rights of a community were past comprehension.

2. A counterpart to the active religious penetration of Israel, by means of which it embraced Monotheism, is furnished by the passive religious penetration of the ancient Indians, which produced the nobler forms of the ancient Pantheism. And as an historical confiscation of the privileges of the Israelitish Monotheists is exhibited in the homeless Jews, so is a similar event exhibited in the case of the Indian Pantheists in the homeless gypsies. The ideal liberty of modern Pantheists was long ago realized in the wandering and forest life of the gypsies.

3. On the import of Christ's death upon the cross, and of the founding of His Church thereupon, with respect to the fulness and peculiarity of the Gospel history, compare the striking treatise of Ullmann, *What does the establishment of the Christian Church by a crucified man assume?* in his collection of shorter writings, entitled *Historisch oder Mythisch*.

4. When, in modern philosophy, the Spirit is regarded merely as the Holy Spirit, the high significance of the successive gradations in which the Spirit manifests His life, is overlooked in the general unity of the spiritual being. The creative Spirit who forms a stone in nature, is certainly identical with the Holy Spirit who leads a Christian heart from worldliness to union with God. But it is only in the latter work that we see the sublime summit of the Spirit's development, the whole glory of His nature as the Sanctifier. The distinctions in the biblical

delineation of the Spirit rest upon depths of perception and definiteness of view which philosophy, with a somewhat ambiguous absence of presentiment, often entirely overlooks.

SECTION V.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE OF MANKIND.

The spiritual life of mankind everywhere manifests an irrepressible attraction towards great personalities. Everywhere in the history of mind, there is seen in full activity the impulse to behold human nature in its heroic proportions, to see the scattered characteristics of human power united in representations of great men, to be internally united with 'the million' by the strong organic centres and heads of the human circle, to contemplate the honours of the race in its higher representatives. The anticipation is everywhere prevalent, that each new great man will bring a new blessing, new help, new comfort (Gen. v. 29),—that deliverance must be born into the world in the depths of elect personal life. The highest expectations are entertained of the very elect : it is they who are to declare the mysteries of the divine life ; nay, the glory of God's majesty is one day to burst forth victoriously from the most perfect and exalted human life. This universal gravitation of minds, attracting them towards great men, is the deepest and most natural basis of all that is christological in mankind at large. In its development and purification, it is more and more perceived to be a decided desire for the highest and most finished personality,—a desire to behold the human race in its spiritual unity, in its true and glorious destiny, in the fulness, beauty, and liberty of its sanctified spiritual power, in complete union with God, and in all the dignity and blessedness resulting from this union.

This christological feature of human nature may be recognised under manifold forms. The heart's need of uniting and surrendering itself to a hero of God, to one nobler than itself, to an intellectual prince, and of becoming rich and strong in him, has been a thousand times perverted by levity, and the intoxication of vanity, into the most credulous and most miser-

able absurdity. Nay, absurdity itself is but the corrupt and perverted form of the need and destination of thousands to be united, saved, and glorified by the true Lord and Prince of their life. It appears in the wild delusions of the thousands who plunge themselves into the snare of any splendid error, as soon as the sound of its decoy is heard ; it brings rich booty to adventurers, fanatics, and conquerors ; it drives whole swarms of deluded and devoted enthusiasts, who failed to recognise the true, to every false Messiah ; and it is the sphere in which the antichristian and demoniac powers will reap their harvest (Matt. xxiv. 24). Such a disposition of human nature must be fatal to it, if there be no salutary object to correspond with it. Men must be ruined by the magic attraction of brilliant but evil genius, if the attraction of the good do not prove more powerful still. They must be torn to pieces by the various attractions they experience from the glorious or strong personalities, within whose influence they are placed, unless they be delivered from all lesser sympathies by one preponderating attraction, and be thus enabled to attain to unity of purpose and life. They must, finally, be irrecoverably lost to liberty, if this *one* personality be not identical with truth, righteousness, and love, and if surrender thereto be not the perfect emancipation of the spirit. Thus does this propensity, even in its perversion, point to the personality of Christ ; for the very existence of a propensity capable of leading its subject into the arms of his destroyer, is a strong appeal to the Redeemer and Deliverer. None but the Prince over all the spiritual kings of the earth, could free all nations from the magic ties of all impure and unholy spirits. The effect of His agency is at once both constraint and liberty, for it is the effect of eternal love, of the divine Spirit.

As the earth, during the polar night, seeks to compensate for the want of daylight by the production of the aurora borealis ; so does every nation, impelled by a yearning after Christ, emit, during its night of heathen darkness, some glimmer of christological light. It was from this visionary impulse towards the dawn, that oracles, priests, lawgivers, and founders of religions arose. 'The nations waited for Him.'

When the sun sets, the stars appear by thousands in the clear sky. If it were possible to conceal for a time from the world the actual life of Jesus, thousands of stars in the heaven

of spiritual life would forthwith bear testimony to His image, yearnings after Him, remembrances of Him, promises concerning Him. No sooner does a critic succeed in impressing some circle of credulous enthusiasts with the notion that he has cast a shade upon the sun of Christ's life in the Gospels, than aspirants forthwith arise by dozens, and offer themselves, as transcending all their predecessors, as founders of new religions, or even as new redeemers, to fill up the supposed vacancy. As counterfeits, they are themselves condemned to testify to the original. And in Christ's Church, the image of His existence shines all the more brightly and gloriously in the hearts of His people, as soon as such eclipses of His name occur.

The sense entertained by the human race of the dignity of prophets, high priests, and kings, is the sense for those exalted gifts of the Spirit which were to unite heaven with earth. Actual endowments, great characters, are the appropriate objects of this sense. From the interaction of the needs of the many and the gifts of the few have these high offices originated, under God's all-ordaining government. Each of these offices, however, requires the other, and none of them is perfect till their union and reality are complete. The true prophet must devote himself to the God who makes him the medium of His revelations; but thus he is at the same time a true priest. The priest who offers himself to God as a sacrifice, attains to a resurrection; and in this resurrection is a true king. If, then, the three offices are in their perfection one, no deep prophetic saying can be heard, not a breath of the priestly spirit can be emitted, not a ray of kingly majesty can shine forth, on earth, without involving a reference to the one personality of Christ. It was the obscure and arbitrary longing for the manifestation of this unity of the divine-human life, which led the ancient Roman to the apotheosis of Cæsar, and the mediæval Roman to an idolatrous veneration of the Pope.

Thus the deep need felt by human nature to do homage to a superior, to find the depths and sublimities of life and its repose in great personalities, is a general prophecy of the God-man. This general reference to Christ seems, indeed, as yet to furnish no distinct image of the life of Jesus by an indication of any of its definite features. But when we analyse this sense of human nature for a higher personality, we shall perceive highly

significant lines, appropriately filling up the general image of the anticipation of Christ.

For, first, this homage-paying impulse is evidently, in the majority of instances, a sense for the worker of miracles, and even for the miraculous. Even the dark world of magic is a mutilated and obscure anticipation of that life, in which the rude materiality of the world vanishes before the brightness and power of the pure spirit, which understands and controls it according to its destiny for the eternal Word. But when, in their myths, the ancient heathen often represented the great heroes of spiritual life as sons of virgin mothers, conceived under the consecration or by the agency of a divine power, they expressed the truth, that the relations of the divine Spirit to the formation of separate individuals are infinitely various—that there are unhallowed, hallowed, and more hallowed births; and they were also tending towards the supreme, the most hallowed birth, in which spiritual agency and human cultivation, the creation and the baptism, the process of formation in time and the existence from eternity, were to meet in one.

But this sense for the miraculous is merely the sense for the Benefactor, the Deliverer, the Redeemer. There is in human nature an irrepressible tendency to hope for coming deliverers and benefactors. Poetry is full of tutelary spirits, helping genii, or angels. And what are all such subjective representations of angels, but a kind of 'second sight,' by which men behold their Redeemer? And just as plainly does a sense for the death of Christ on the cross, and its significance, show itself among mankind. We have already spoken of tragedy. Tragedy recognises the meaning of sin, of the curse, and of the catastrophe; and points to that wonderful relation in humanity, found to exist almost from house to house, that the innocent should suffer for the guilty, that the noblest heart in every human circle always bears the greatest part of that circle's burden, that the full punishment of a family sin usually falls on a comparatively innocent head. By her representations of minor catastrophes and relative atonements, she leads to the idea of the great universal catastrophe of humanity, and the real and absolute atonement involved therein. Tragedy, in its christological meaning, opposes all those views of history and Christianity which would, with convenient superficiality, steal past the cross of Christ; while man's proneness to be deeply

moved and strangely elevated by tragic emotion, shows him to be fitted to experience and to discern both judgment and atonement in the great and sacred sufferings of *one* man. Tragic poetry has not, indeed, been the product of the intellectual life of all cultivated nations, but the need of sacrifice has; and the import of sacrifice has ever been justly viewed in its reference to the import of the death of Christ. Even in those horrible sacrifices which consciousness of guilt extorted from the excited frenzy of the heathen in the worship of Moloch, in the self-inflicted tortures of the fakeers, and in that most deeply degenerate form of the felt need of an atonement, self-murder, may be seen the actings of that spiritual impulse, which entertained the presentiment that dissolution of life would procure remission of guilt before God's judgment-seat; and which, even in its darkest delusions, was tending towards the reality of an act of sacrifice, in which victim and priest, divine mystery and human self-surrender (or, in other words, obedience and sacrifice), the suffering of an individual and the suffering of mankind, judgment and atonement, death and victory over death, are miraculously blended.

But if human nature could in its dreams and fictions thus forebode, and in its feverish delusions even rave of, the great atoning death, an obscure notion of a resurrection also could not but run through its mental life and the utterances of that life. Accordingly, we find that all nations have been inclined above all things to doubt the utter death of those great or terrible individuals who have either cheered or disturbed their lives. When Nero died, it was said by both Christians and heathens, that he had only retired into obscurity; the Christians said, he would return as Antichrist. Of Napoleon it was said, long after his death, that he still was living in concealment, and would one day reappear. Frederic Barbarossa was to awaken and come forth gloriously from the tomb, in which he was but slumbering till the appointed time. In the myths too of the ancient nations, it was through the sufferings of death that heroes attained to the glorification of their lives (*e.g.*, Hercules.) But to pass into the sphere of ordinary actual life, let us ask, what does man's dread of death really mean? Is it a merely instinctive feeling, such as is sometimes seen even in the lower animals? Or is it not rather evident, that this dread is the expression of a spiritual feeling, of the indignation and protest of personal consciousness,

against the appearance of dissolution—that it cries for, and proclaims a resurrection in some place or other, while the various degrees of joy which have been felt in death, form an ascent to that exalted summit, the victory over death, which the Gospel history records?

Thus is the Gospel history surrounded by many concentric circles, in each of which the actual allusions to this history are either plainly or dimly perceived. Theology, in her relation to these general christological indications, seems still to occupy a position similar to that filled by natural philosophy, when fossil skeletons were taken for *lusus naturæ*. Her task, however, is to learn, like natural science, to infer the whole living organism from its fragmentary remains—the life of Christ from the separate fragments of christological allusion found among the human race. As the musical virtuoso can perceive the theme in almost every separate passage of a good composition, so will the Christian spirit learn to discern, with ever increasing clearness, the theme of the world's history in all its separate harmonies and discords.

NOTES.

1. The preceding remarks are but an attempt to point out the principal incidents of christological allusion to be met with in the common history of mankind. The thorough working out of this subject cannot but be promoted by the researches of Christian missionaries, and must, in return, be of the greatest importance in the thorough carrying on of missionary operations. Paul at Athens argued from matters granted by his hearers, and by them made ready to his hand. Arguments of a like kind arise from a sense for the general christological allusions found throughout the world. If these allusions are ignored, and mythologies esteemed to be dark to their very foundations,—if the nations are regarded as autochthones, and their religions as mere local superstitions with no allusions to aught besides,—we shall hardly enter into their circle of ideas. The star of the magian, as well as the altar to the unknown God, though too commonly considered isolated instances of subjective combination; are, in this respect, striking New Testament indications of a general heathen Christology, as well as clear directions in missionary work. Is it not evident, for ex-

ample, that most nations go beyond their merely national consciousness, and express their union with the whole race of mankind in some legend or expectation? In one, some great alteration of circumstances is expected to arise from the East, in another, from the West. Most heathen religions, Mohammedanism not excluded, express a foreboding of their own dissolution. The expectation or announcement of mysterious heaven-sent men, who are to unite heaven and earth, is everywhere prevalent.

PART III.

THE HISTORIC RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

SECTION I.

THE PHENOMENON OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

AT the head of the books of the New Testament stand four narratives, which in their relation to literature, to the civilisation of the world, to history, to the Bible, to Christianity, and to each other, form but one single phenomenon.

Considered merely as literary productions, they appear as compositions announcing, in a few pages, events, ideas, and doctrines which, as the principles of the Christian Church, were henceforth powerfully to affect, to animate, and to transform the world; compositions in which the humblest pens depict the mightiest matters in clear, simple, and effective strokes, and which have become the centres of a vast, an ever-increasing and most noble, universal literature. Merely secular literature has a thousand times entered into competition with these books in the matter of style, and has, in many instances, exhibited greater distinctness of character, more correct models of narrative, of reflection, of poetry, of discourse. But there is a nobility in the naturalness of the Gospel style, which preserves it in perpetual vigour, while many more refined forms of literature have already become, as far as concerns their original power, obsolete; *e.g.*, the descriptive narrative, the Ciceronian declamation, the machinery of gods and goddesses in poetry. The style of the Gospel narrative is everywhere more distinguished for wonderful conciseness than for copiousness; while with respect to its moral tone, we find ardent zeal manifested with such tranquillity, admiration expressed with such moderation, a sharp and determined opposition to all evil powers, and

even to the devil himself, waged with a dignity so noble, that we can easily conceive how these pages have, even in their style, upheld to the world's end the credit of the *New Testament*.

The relation in which the four Gospels stand to secular history, is an harmonious one, since they narrate facts which are not only recognised as historically true in their general features, but also fill up a blank, which, but for their presence, would exist in the midst of universal history, and involve every part of it in obscurity. Not only Josephus, but also the Roman historians who depict the times of Christ, know of His life, His world-famed death—the crucifixion, and its great result—the incipient formation of His Church. Of the inner relations of the life of Jesus however, of its supernatural elements, they could of course, from their point of view, know nothing.

The four Gospels occupy in the Bible, a position midway between the prophetic writings and apostolic Epistles, and are indissolubly connected with both. They form a key to the Scriptures, the loss of which would render them but a closed sanctuary. When a contradiction is sought between the spirit of the Gospels and that of the prophets, or a discrepancy between the Pauline Christ and the evangelic Christ, the judgment must, in either case, have been warped by dwelling too much upon details. Christ, and the everlasting Gospel in Him, is the deep point of union towards which the prophets tend, from which the apostles proceed. The representation of the life of Jesus in the Gospels is in entire accordance with both the theocratic and the apostolic spirit.¹ The apostolic Epistles appear in all their parts as developments, in which the historic Christ of the Gospels is made, by His Spirit, the life of mankind; and it is from them that we learn to appreciate the genuine and thorough Christianity of the four Gospels. The Evangelists, indeed, are not identical with Christ. They are not perfect. Their communications may be inexact and uncertain in details, as appears from comparing and testing their accounts. But their individual deficiencies are cancelled by the fulness of their

¹ They who distinguish the religion of Jesus from the religion of the apostles, and again recognise diversities of religion among the apostles themselves, might much more easily discover differences of religion between one town and another, between one village and another, in the province of Rationalism.

totality. They bring forward in their narratives and representations nothing that is unchristian or inconsistent with the general effect of Christianity, though they have been most stringently tested and reviewed in this respect. The accusations which have been brought forward—as, for instance, the history of the swine of the Gadarenes, the cursing of the fruitless fig-tree, and the like—have only served as proofs that the sublimity and refinement of the apostolic feeling for genuine Christianity has not been attained by those who make such accusations. What would Jesus have done, *e.g.*, if He had forbidden the devils to enter the herd of swine? Would He not thereby have assumed an unusual authority in the land of the Gadarenes?¹ (Comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. p. 42.) The primitive Christianity of the Gospels is exhibited not only in their abstinence from the fancies of apocryphal fictions, but also in their positive contents. The Evangelists had the courage to testify in the world to that great reality of which they were themselves assured. They are Christian because they simply exhibit Christ, the miraculous life in the centre of the world, and because the several miracles appear to them as but its natural result, the slender branches of the strong tree of that divine-human life. But their Christianity appears also in the fact, that they not only preserved His high deeds, but also His deep sayings. Thousands of pious souls would have feared to deliver these mighty sayings, pure and undiluted; *e.g.*, the sayings, ‘Love your enemies;’ ‘If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out,’ etc. But the heroic stature of their minds caused them to appreciate the vigour, power, and purity of such wonderful teaching; and trusting to the interpreting Spirit, they despised the pretended offence of the uninitiated, and proved the maturity of their own Christianity by faithfully transmitting them in all their Christian fulness.

Finally, when we consider the relation borne by the four

¹ The cursing of the fig-tree has been censured as a sort of trespass in the wood. In this case, the words of the curse must be regarded as an axe or some such tool. Göthe somewhere says, ‘I do not conceal that I curse the people.’ No one, however, withers away in consequence; therefore no blame attaches to him. But this withered tree is brought up against Christ as if He had destroyed it, contrary to the law of the land. (Comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. ii. p. 256.)

Gospels to each other, we behold a mystery at which criticism has hitherto toiled in vain, and which cannot be fully solved until it is perceived that complete inspiration is so entirely one with perfect freedom of individuality, that the union of various witnesses in testifying to the truth of the Gospel, imperatively requires the most distinct individual diversity in their respective testimonies. This wonderful relation of diversity and unity is expressed in the title of the Gospels: *Εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Ματθαίου*, etc. (The Gospel according to Matthew, etc.). In each book we have the same Gospel according to a different individual view. In times when the Christian mind is in a natural and candid frame, the unity of the Gospel will be the prevailing subject of contemplation. It is thus that unprejudiced Christian feeling always deals with the Gospels. In times of more careful examination, diversities will be more closely observed. In times of unbelief, the delusion will be entertained that the diversity is so great as to destroy the unity. It is a very important matter to the military pedant, whether the heroes who are sent into the field wear gaiters of equal length or not! The unity of the Gospels is most strikingly manifested in the fact that even Mark and John, the Evangelists who differ the most widely from each other, do yet most evidently announce but one Gospel; their diversity, in the fact that even Matthew and Mark, who the most closely resemble each other, maintain their respective originality. It has, indeed, been recently asserted of John, that his Gospel does not so much exhibit the Christ of John as John the Christian.¹ But in making this assertion, due allowance has not been made for those dynamic relations which prevail everywhere, and especially in the kingdom of God. If it were true that in the fourth Gospel John had made himself more prominent than his Master, he would be no disciple of Christ, but an apostate, though an unconscious one, and the founder of a sect of his own. In this case, it might be said of him, in modern language, that he had gone beyond Christ. If John conceived a more ideal Christianity than Christ, the latter must be degraded into his mere forerunner, and both, to be consistent

¹ Compare Weisse, *Die evang. Gesch.* vol. i. p. 111; [and so, in effect, Renan, *Vie de Jesus*, p. 24, etc., of the Introduction. For a thorough refutation of this opinion, see Davidson, *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. i. p. 299.—ED.]

with truth, must announce this fact. But when John confesses to finding the whole originality of his Christianity in Christ, it is doing him injustice to discredit his assertion. If, then, Christ is the originator of his views, his representation of the life of Jesus does not essentially differ from that of Mark. Mark indeed forms, together with Matthew and Luke, a decided contrast to the Gospel of John: they have a common tone, from which that of John is very different. But yet in this contrast the unity of the Gospel is unmistakeable. On one side, we have the Son of man, the genuine formation of the divine Spirit; on the other, the Son of God, the perfect manifestation in the flesh of human nature. There, the works of Christ manifested in rich abundance as the effects of His word; here, His words appearing as the great deeds of His life and deciding His fate. There, the light-bringing day; here, the sacred light. The Sermon on the Mount points in truth to the same way of salvation as the discourse with Nicodemus; and the resurrection of Lazarus ranks as the highest fact of the kind with the raising of Jairus' daughter, and of the widow's son at Nain. How identical in all essential respects is Christ's conflict with Judaism in the first three Gospels, and in that of John! If we turn our glance for a moment from the single to the synoptic Gospels, we behold the Christ of St John instituting the Lord's Supper, while in John's Gospel, *e.g.*, in the purification of the temple, we recognise the synoptic Christ. Diversity is, however, quite as apparent as unity. The Synoptists have a peculiar manner of expression very different from that of John. They relate, partially at least, the history of Christ's childhood, while John is occupied with His eternal existence before the world was; and two of them, *viz.*, Mark and Luke, narrate His ascension, while Matthew and John suffer the Redeemer's person to disappear in a final manifestation of His glory.¹ The narratives of the Synoptists are rich in accounts of miracles, while John relates only a few, and such only as are most deeply important as demonstrations of the truth of the Gospel history. The former

¹ The aim of Matthew, in the conclusion of his Gospel, is to depict the Lord, as the Prince of the kingdom of heaven, in contrast to His former delineation of the Crucified One. The conclusion of John's Gospel concerns the Apostles Peter and John. Hence neither had special occasion to relate the ascension, which, in their view, was involved in the resurrection.

report such discourses of Christ as cast a light upon the ways of the world¹ and the way to the Father, or the laws and relations of the kingdom of God in its development; John, on the other hand, preserves those which relate to the centre of the kingdom of God, the personality of Christ, or the significance of His personality in its relations to God, to the world, and to believers. The synoptic Evangelists narrate the Lord's more public agency and works, the scene of which was chiefly Galilee,² and hence for the most part Galilean events: John relates more especially the prominent features in the development of the Lord's life, and those conflicts, both outward and spiritual, with pharisaic Judaism which were the occasion of His death; hence mostly scenes in Judea. While the former contemplate chiefly the history, the office, the work of Christ, His ministry and His sufferings in His work, John collects those incidents in which the spiritual perfection, the abounding love, the kingly glory of Christ are most significantly displayed. Hence his peculiarity not only of form, but also of matter, results from an inward principle, while the difference of matter must also have been increased by the circumstance that John, according to ecclesiastical tradition, had regard to the three former Gospels in the composition of his own.³ Even the three first Gospels, with all their essential unity and similarity, manifest distinct originality in their composition and statements. Each displays its peculiarity in the choice and treatment as well as in the position of incidents. Thus, in every respect, each preserves its independence, its own free and fresh view of the subject. Their similarity, however, in matter, form, and expression is so very evident, that a reader seeking only the

¹ [What Augustine calls 'dicta quæ ad informandos mores vitæ præsentis maxime valerent.' De consens. Evang. i. 5.—ED.]

² Hence arise those historical inaccuracies which are a result of the real motive of the composition.

³ Jerome, Catal. script. eccles. c. 9. [Jerome's words are: 'Sed et aliam (besides the intention of John to refute Cerinthus and the Ebionites) causam hujus Scripturæ ferunt: quod quum legisset Matthæi, Marci, et Lucæ volumina, probaverit quidem textum historiæ, et vera eos dixisse firmaverit; sed unius tantum anni, in quo et passus est, post carcerem Johannis, historiam texuisse. Prætermisso itaque anno, cujus acta a tribus exposita fuerant, superioris temporis antequam Johannes clauderetur in carcerem, gesta narravit, sicut manifestum esse poterit his qui diligenter quatuor Evangeliorum volumina legerint.' But see Davidson's *Introduction to the New Testament*, i. 320 ff.—ED.]

religious impression they produce, always thinks he is reading but one writing, one Gospel.

By these remarkable relations are the four Gospels shown to be four great and independent testimonies, strengthened as they are by their very peculiarities, to the life and miracles of the Lord Jesus Christ for His Church in all ages.

NOTE.

The relations borne by the four Gospels to each other have come under our notice in the present section, though the relations of the Gospels to the Evangelists have not yet been treated of. This subject, as also the distinctive characteristics of the several Gospels, will occupy us when we treat of the criticism of the Gospels. We are here only concerned with what is more immediately evident, viz., that an unprejudiced acquaintance with the Gospels confirms the following general conclusions concerning their mutual relation : 1. That with regard to their matter, they all form but one Gospel ; 2. that with regard to their form, each Gospel must be considered as a distinctly original composition.

SECTION II.

THE FOUR GOSPELS AS RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

The four Gospels, in the form in which we have them, may with perfect justice be pronounced to be credible historical records of the life of Jesus. They are literary representations presenting us with purely objective testimony ; they are the products of a perfect, and therefore infinitely tranquil enthusiasm, in entire unison with the object which excited it. No secondary motive is found here, to create a discord or awaken suspicion. Their form is the result of that entire surrender to the manifestations of the perfect image of God which was one with the most powerful subjective appropriation of the same. The purity with which they reflect, as instruments, the rich and glorious reality of the life of Christ, imparts to their moral aspect a nobility which must ever enhance their credibility. With princely magnanimity do they exhibit the essential, while they but very slightly touch upon the non-essential. They calculate

upon receptive, like-minded readers, who can sympathize in their homage to what is heavenly and essential. Their very inaccuracies in non-essentials enhance the sublimity and trustworthiness of their announcements. They seem to have been incapable of anticipating that critics might form their inaccuracies into a plea against the credibility of their evangelical testimony. Many a friend of the Gospel may have felt vexed that the Evangelists have not shown more lawyer-like exactness, for the sake of such observers as would take kings and emperors for beggars, if they met them in homely garments. But they themselves seem to have been, in this respect, very proud, or rather very free from care; and their carelessness may well be regarded as their noblest credential. They addressed themselves to the sincere minds of their fellow-believers, with a plain testimony according to their own views and most assured convictions, and delivered the treasure to them; on the other hand, they gave, by their sublime negligence and with a bold generosity, a portion also to that lawyer-like glance which is ever searching into statements to find erroneous views and contradictions. But how well does that portion of history which they describe as its central point fit in with universal history! This very fragment completes general history, clears up its obscurity, disentangles its intricacies, explains the curse resting on the world, and reveals its destiny. Thus these books are the most peculiar, the most universal, of documents. They form also one half of the New Testament, fitting into the other half like the severed halves of an apple. Christianity, moreover, recognises in them her primitive sacred records. By all these relations they are continually receiving fresh authentication, as well as by the relation in which they stand to each other.

With respect to this mutual relation, the manner in which they corroborate each other recalls the poet's words:

'Kennst du das Haus, auf Säulen ruht sein Dach.'¹

In our days an effort has been made to support the assumption that these four evangelic testimonies must of necessity cancel, or at least mutually weaken, each other. The contrary, however, is far more evident, viz., that by their mutual relations they attain the stability of an immoveable edifice. For the relation between their discrepancies and accordances is so

¹ Comp. Irenæus, C. hæres. lib. iii. c. 11.

unique, that we are again and again forced to view them as four independent testimonies to one and the same thing; and, consequently, to each other. The wonderful nature of this connection, and its preservative effect, have not yet been sufficiently appreciated. It may be compared to the resisting force of a forest when maintaining itself against the storm. A tree standing alone is easily bent and broken by the wind, while a tree in the midst of a wood is kept upright by the common strength of the whole group. Thus do the four Gospels support each other in the sheltering neighbourhood of the other books of the Bible. Ordinary criticism offers the best proof of this fact. If a critic, for example, would attack the Gospel of St John, he tries to obtain help in this enterprise by acknowledging the authenticity of the three first Gospels. Thus, however, the Gospel of John is but confirmed by means of its inward relation with the acknowledged books. Again, the attack starts from the assumption that the Gospel of St John is the genuine record of the Gospel history, and the discrepancies between this and the synoptical Gospels are made grounds of suspicion against the latter. But even in this case, the effect of coincidence is too powerful: if John is genuine, their matter is, in all essential points, authenticated. Again, Matthew and Luke are taken up, to the prejudice of Mark. But the latter is so firmly rooted in matters common to all, that any peculiarity is but the greater proof of the independence of his testimony. If, on the contrary, Mark is made the primitive Gospel at the expense of the other two, Matthew and Luke each present peculiarities, and at the same time furnish complementary matter of sufficient importance to establish their respective originality, while by the matter which they have in common with Mark, their authenticity is abundantly corroborated. These general remarks obtrude themselves on our notice when we contemplate the Gospels in their mutual relations as primitive records of the life of Jesus, in presence of modern criticism. Criticism may try their authenticity, and in this way raise doubts requiring to be entered into in a thoroughly circumstantial and scientific manner; it may find a multitude of difficulties in separate passages, especially in the discrepancies between the Gospels; but when it tries to overthrow any one Gospel, as a whole, by means of another, it misconceives their strong and mysterious connection,

and does but prepare its own defeat. The Gospels are so divine in the unity and conclusiveness of their inner nature, that all uncandid criticism must be discomfited in its misconception of this essential glory; while they are so human in their external form, and in their peculiarities, that they seem themselves to invite us to test their statements by the light of fair and candid criticism. Thus are they ready to answer all kinds of criticism; and their cause is so pure and sublime, that it can but gain by every fresh inquiry. Nay, it is their property to give birth to true criticism, and to condemn false criticism to the death it deserves.

NOTE.

The four Gospels seem like a delicate web of truth stretched out to catch all unfair criticism. They entangle all such criticism in its own inconsistencies. Or we may compare them to a wondrous grove of trees forming an enchanted forest, in which the unclean spirit of profane criticism gets lost and entangled, and wanders about restless and perplexed, unable to find its way. This magic power is exercised by the four Gospels, because the single history of the life of the Lord Jesus, which they furnish, is presented under the different aspects of four widely differing and typically significant individual views. This four-fold reflection of the one light of the world, when viewed askance, presents a thousand dazzling reflected lights, completely confusing the vision, while a direct view of the four reflections shows but *one* light. In this respect it may be affirmed, that the mutual relation of the four Gospels more excites and evokes the criticism of the human mind than anything else, and at the same time becomes itself the criticism of all false criticism. Who would undertake to harmonize the results of modern criticism? A harmony which should seek to bring these critics into accordance with each other, would find a thousand times more difficulties than those harmonies which seek to reconcile the discrepancies between the several Gospels. The well-known lines, referring to the government of the celestial powers, may with a slight variation be applied to the four Gospels:

‘Ihr führt die Kritik ins Leben ein,
Und lasst die Arme schuldig werden;
Dann überlasst ihr sie der Pein
Denn jede Schuld rächt sich auf Erden.’

PART IV

CRITICISM OF THE TESTIMONIES TO THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

SECTION I.

GENERAL SURVEY.

THE Gospel history is, in its very nature, a criticism of the world—a test of the world by the absolutely correct measure of its eternal destination, which is manifested in Christ. It is a sentence passed upon all other lives, upon the assumption of the truth of the divine-human life. And in communicating itself to, and implanting itself in humanity, it diffuses a life which is essentially critical; it originates a critical examination, not only of the world's worth, but also of its own merits. Thus it is in the nature of the critical influence of the Gospel history, that it should evoke an antagonistic criticism on the part of all those whose points of view it subordinates or opposes. The philosophy, however, of Christian consciousness, with respect to its conviction of the certainty of Gospel history, must be ever more and more developed by the dialectics of this antagonistic criticism, and thus an evangelical criticism of Gospel history arises. This criticism, on its formal side, institutes tests by which the Gospel history is to be tried, while, on its material side, it undertakes a scientific examination of the nature of the Gospels, and of Gospel history.

SECTION II.

THE GOSPEL HISTORY AS CRITICISM.

No one acquainted with Christianity will deny that it came into the world as a criticism of Judaism and Heathenism.

Speaking generally, this critical agency has been exercised by its spirit, but it is the Gospel history which has chiefly and definitely exhibited this spirit. This is the condemnation, *the crisis*, that light is come into the world (John iii. 19). Christianity being then in its nature critical, must neither be accepted, maintained, nor defended in an uncritical manner. Why callest thou Me good? said Christ to the young ruler, who acknowledged Him with superficial precipitation, and proceeded to test that enthusiastic follower by the remark: Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay His head. The prejudiced criticism which Nathanael opposed to faith in Christ was treated with marked forbearance; the sceptical criticism with which Thomas doubted the resurrection, with considerate and convincing patience. Christianity cannot commit its cause to rash and blind enthusiasts, nor to thoughtless and fanatic champions. It would communicate itself to the world, not in mere dead precepts, but according to its own nature, that is, as the spiritual life of the world; therefore it calls upon men to test and examine its contents. It would entirely liberate man, and reconcile him with God; it would therefore especially liberate and reconcile his understanding. It would further become, through the Spirit, the presence of eternal life in the Church; it therefore presents to the subjective spirit no absolutely closed and rigid external historical tradition. It was by the prompting of the Spirit that the Church was to recall all that Christ said and did (John xiv. 26). Christianity will itself be the instrument by means of which man is to judge, to comprehend, to renew, all that is in his world; hence it requires even of man's conscience, that he shall be so thoroughly convinced of its spiritual truth as not to prejudice its interests by his own uncertainty and want of harmony. 'Thou canst not follow Me now,' said Christ in this sense to Peter. From its very nature, Christianity is willing to stand the critical testing of every mind, that it may rest entirely upon its own statements. The Gospel history would be received and appropriated in a critical spirit, because it is itself the criticism of the spirit.

NOTE.

'Criticism' is spoken of in our days as if it were an infallible intellectual organ, a new philosophy, religion, or authority, de-

monstrably and definitely present somewhere. But this assumption involves part of the monstrous superstition with which modern morbid idealism is infected. In this vague sense, criticism is now this head, now that; perhaps the head of one under the delirium of fever, of a madman, perhaps the head of a rogue. In a more temperate decade, the critic, instead of uttering the spell, Criticism pronounces! might perhaps have said, This is my humble opinion! or, This is the proof which convinces me! As long as the criticism of an individual is contented to appear as the subjective activity of his own mind, it must be allowed to speak, and should be listened to with a respect proportioned to the reasons it exhibits. But as soon as it is spoken of as a power, the critic must either be able to describe its principles, its rules, its organic form, or clearly express his desire to be regarded as an incarnation of the critical spirit. In the latter case, we should know what to think of him. It is very remarkable that the assumption that some kind of incongruity exists between Christianity and criticism, has for a long time been considered a valid one. Is not Christianity criticism? Is not its spirit pure and mature truth, manifested in and corroborated by universal history? Does this spirit need assistance, in its expressions and dealings, from the rude, shallow, obscure spirit manifested, it may be, in single individuals, and more or less entangled, as it still is, in nature? The assumption that pure truth must be freed from its shell of Christianity by the help of criticism (a consummation to be effected by the intellect of the natural man, with its philosophical implements), is in direct opposition to the Christian assumption. But the legitimacy of this assumption is meanwhile still confirmed, in opposition to all the false messiahs of criticism, who are, so far at least, right in entirely separating their power from that of Christianity, or of the Gospels. The result will show from which side the criticism arises; but in any case the theologian is too easily deceived, if he from the first grants the title of 'criticism' to the new intellectual powers which would test the Gospels.¹

¹ [Cf. the admirable introductory chapter of Neander's *Life of Christ*, and also the chapter entitled 'Criticism a Necessity,' in Ebrard's *Gospel History*, Clark's Translation, 1863.—ED.]

SECTION III.

ANTAGONISTIC CRITICISM IN GENERAL.

Every disposition appears under the form of a judgment passed on others by him who is the subject thereof. Ill-humour at the wet weather calls the weather bad. The ill-humour of the child at its father's refusal calls the father unkind. The reproving and correcting agency of Christianity upon the world calls forth much ill-will, and this ill-will settles into antagonism, and expresses itself in antagonistic judgments. This antagonistic criticism was already full blown during Christ's sojourn on earth. His miracles were criticised by the accusation that He cast out devils through Beelzebub; His teaching, by the complaint that He seduced the people; His life, by the declaration that He was gluttonous and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. The first work which united the several antagonistic opinions of this kind into one general criticism was, the crucifixion of Jesus Himself. The agency of antagonistic criticism in the world cannot be extinguished till all the dispositions contrary to Christianity are annihilated; in other words, it must, in conformity with its nature, last as long as the world does. With reference to its form, however, it changes its garb according to the fashion of the age in which it appears. In a rude age, it will in round terms declare the Gospel history to be an imposition; in a frivolous age, it will use the weapons of ridicule; and in a philosophical age, it will assume an aspect of philosophic repose and inquiry. It may, however, even in this guise, be distinguished from true criticism by the following marks. First, being founded on subordinate principles, it will necessarily proceed upon them. Secondly, since it cannot possess the genuine interest of the eternal ideal reality which is manifested in the incarnation of the eternal Word, because it is in principle opposed thereto, it will, as a result of the oblique impulse it has received from its false principles, be driven to subreptions. Thirdly, being unable to avow its rejection of the Christian principles of the Gospel history (since it would appear in its examination of this history as an agency inherent in Christianity, and friendly to it), and being unwilling to commit

itself to the recognition of those principles in their results, it will mingle in a hateful manner operations which seem to recognise the principles of the Gospel with such as deny it. A history of 'criticism' would consist of a series of such proceedings, beginning with unconscious self-deception, advancing to subtle special pleading, and terminating in utter perfidy.

SECTION IV.

ANTAGONISTIC CRITICISM IN ITS SUBORDINATE PRINCIPLES AND ASPECTS.

Considered as a history of the facts in which the Godhead was united with manhood, the Gospel must be regarded as a spiritual and intellectual height lying far above the principles, dispositions, and insight of Heathenism or natural religion. Wherever, then, natural religion is in any way active, or even opposes the agency of Christianity, its principles become the principles of an antagonistic criticism, and these principles appear in definite forms and expressions.

When Heathenism is regarded as the religion of nature in contrast to the religion of the Spirit, it is generally viewed exclusively on that side which would find the divine directly in nature, which identifies it with her and worships it in her. In this case, Heathenism is viewed in its piety, in its superstitious exaltation, in its deification of the creature. But in this manner it is not fully comprehended, and still less are its real roots appreciated. For this superstitious piety stands in polar interaction with a deep-lying impiety; and the monstrous superstition which it exhibits, is founded upon a monstrous unbelief. The self-chosen idol of the heathen only attains its magic splendour by more or less undeifying the world which is exterior to it. Its fane is surrounded and borne up by the sphere of the profane. And even when the heathen multiplies his gods, when his world seems in his eyes everywhere radiant with divine glory, he only attains to this multiplication and partition of the divine in nature by making general matter form the dark, unspiritual background which scatters all these lights, and in its gloomy power rises

above and encloses them. In a word, Heathenism cannot get free from the eternity of matter: it wants the knowledge of a God who, in His eternal and spiritual light and power, is self-possessed, self-determined, and self-comprehended; who ordains, creates, and governs the world; whose eternal power and wisdom call it into existence, and before whose majesty it vanishes. Its divinity is limited and restrained by the dead matter of a world whose existence seems too real, too mighty, to allow its profane independence to be utterly surrendered in the beginning of the world, to the glory of the Father, in the midst of the world, to the glory of the Son, at the end of the world, to the glory of the Holy Ghost.

Even heathen consciousness cannot indeed mistake the superiority of Godhead to the ever unspiritual, material world. It views this superiority, however, under various aspects, according to the various forms of its own life. First, the heathen looks upon the Godhead with the drowsiness of his own natural religious passivity; and in this case he beholds it everywhere appearing, and everywhere disappearing in the mighty process of the material life of nature. Matter is to him the absolute darkness into which it sinks and from which it again emerges in the many gods, or in the *one* idea of universal divinity. This is the pantheistic point of view. But then a moral sorrow, and indignation against the power which matter seems to exercise over spirit, are excited within him: he cannot endure that divinity should be thus carried down the dark stream of natural forces, and tries to make in his own mind a separation between light and darkness. To this, however, he can never attain without making the God of light supreme over all. This god seems to be the almighty Creator of the world. But in his inmost nature that eternal darkness, which the heathen mind cannot separate from divinity, already exists and prevails. Hence his creation is more passive than active, a pathological incident; and as his life is developed, the darkness which lay at its root becomes more and more prominent. Darker and still darker worlds and structures are its manifestation. This is the ancient emanation-doctrine of the contemplative Oriental. It views God as the bright Father of light, the world as His dark offspring. Modern Pantheism, on the contrary, makes the divine nature arise, by an entirely opposite form of emanation, from

the dark foundation of the material universe, as the result of the moral effort of its intellectual power. Here at length the Divinity appears as the result of the saddest process of mature human consciousness, the bright offspring of a dark mother.¹ The chief deficiency of Pantheism is its failing to recognise that Holy Spirit which rules the world, and transforms it into the sanctuary of the eternal God.

In the emanation-doctrine of Pantheism is seen, however, a transition to that separation between the light of spiritual life, and the darkness of natural life, which Dualism completes. Dualism is the moral effort of the heathen to free his God from materialism. He excludes matter from his notion of God, and thus forms the conception of an immense and mighty struggle between material light and material darkness. He now calls the light Good, the good God. But he is obliged also to define evil as the evil God, because to him it is eternal matter of a dark kind, which the good God finds opposed to Himself, and which He can indeed restrain, but not annihilate. He can restrain it, because it is matter, and therefore weaker than spirit; He cannot annihilate it, because it is eternal and substantial. It is from this religious point of view that the heathen fails to recognise in God the almighty Father.

He has, however, begun to recognise in the moral and powerful God, the Being who governs the material world, restrains what is evil, arranges what is formless, and, by continual decrees which penetrate to the material as laws, forms all into an orderly creation. In this perfected creation, God appears indeed in super-mundane, but not in intra-mundane glory, because He is viewed as only subduing by conflicts and victories, and restraining by iron laws, a world originally opposed to Him. Matter, in its subjection to law, is indeed no longer the darkness which overwhelms the Divinity, nor the evil which subdues Him, but it is the rigidity which limits Him in the full manifestation of His glory in the world. Such a view of divinity is a mutilated Monotheism,—it is Deism, which cannot recognise the Son of God, or God in the glory of His Son.

Thus we have discovered three heathen principles subordinate to Christianity, which are capable of becoming the principles of a criticism antagonistic to the Gospel history. In the

¹ [See the reference to Feuerbach in Part I. sec. i, p. 35.—ED.]

history of religion, there is, however, a continual interweaving of these different principles of Heathenism, especially of Pantheism and Dualism. These contrasts, like all contrasts of a morbid kind, which form a spurious element common to both, run to unnatural extremes, and often reconcile their differences by over-leaping each others' boundaries, and by mutual intermingling. The various forms of the emanation-system form the border land, in which this mingling of Pantheism and Dualism takes place. The emanation-system is ever oscillating between the decision which calls what is natural, evil, and that which calls what is evil, natural.

Mutilated Monotheism, on the other hand, keeps itself more or less aloof, in form at least, from these two extremes, which were so closely united with it in its heathen principles, because it recognises God as a spiritual power raised above the world, and ruling its darkness by imposing laws upon it. In its essence, however, it partakes of both extremes: it is pantheistic, because its universe possesses a life properly its own, separate from God, ever conformed to laws, and so far divine; but still more dualistic, inasmuch as its rigid conformity to laws would force the eternal God to behold inactively, and in super-mundane quiescence, the mechanism of those laws of nature which He had Himself ordained. From the commencement of Christianity to the present day, these two principles, viz., that of dualistic Pantheism, as well as that of pantheistic but still more dualistic Deism, have asserted themselves against the principles of Christianity; and the results have appeared in a long parallel series of productions on the part of antagonistic criticism.

It is, however, self-evident, that these principles can only appear in their unmitigated form outside the Christian Church. Wherever they have intruded within it, they must have been more or less christianized. They were broken by the power of Christianity, but were, even in their mutilated condition, tenacious of existence, in proportion as they had taken up some of the elements and powers of the Christian faith, and had strengthened each other by becoming mutually interwoven, and consolidated into compounds.

It was in the Græco-Romish Heathenism, or in Persian Dualism, that the purely extra-christian form of pantheistic Dualism chiefly opposed Christianity. Its modified and semi-christian

forms have been principally developed in Gnosticism, Manichæism, Spinozism, in the Bohemian theosophy, in the earlier system of Schelling, in the Hegelian philosophy, and in its critical offshoots.—The wholly extra-christian phenomena of dualistic Pantheism have manifested their opposition to Christianity in Talmudism, in Mahometanism, and, in modern times, in Materialism. Its christianized forms have appeared, in the ancient Church, in Ebionitism and Monarchianism; in the modern, in Deism and Rationalism.

The criticism which the Gospel history experienced on the part of unmixed pantheistic-dualistic Heathenism, appears in the martyrdoms of the first centuries of the Church, and in the literary accusations and works by which this persecution was accompanied. The Church first experienced this antagonistic criticism from the prevailing pantheistic Heathenism, in the persecutions which it underwent from the Roman power; and afterwards from the prevailing dualistic views, in the martyrdoms encountered in the Persian kingdom.

The dualistic principle, however, was gradually introduced into the Christian Church, and was constrained to appear, within this sphere, under a maimed and modified form. It is under such a form that we behold it in the system of the Gnostics. The essentially distinctive mark of Gnosticism is overlooked, when its relation to the Church is lost sight of. It exhibits a series of systems, misconceiving the pure ideality of creation, and hence the Old Testament; and therefore incapable of believing in the manifestation of the Son of God in the flesh, and equally incapable of forming a society in separation from the Church; or in other words, of exhibiting a powerful embodiment of their ideas. It is the latter circumstance which makes these systems Gnosticism. The climax of Gnosticism is Manichæism, which under various disguises glides through the middle ages, and finds religious seriousness, in its morbid form of melancholy, the congenial soil in which its old and scattered seeds will always spring up. The system of Spinoza seems to present the greatest contrast to Manichæism, exhibiting, as it does, the entire dissolution of this morbid dualistic effort. But even in this case the existence of one extreme cannot but testify to that of the other. The acts of the Divine Being are, according to Spinoza's views, utterly

pathological; this Being, in His constant torpor, is resolved into His attributes, or into the incidents of life—a dark fatalism alone gives Him any existence. But the dualism in question reappears still more distinctly in the system of Jacob Böhm, and, by its means, pervades even to our own days, though under various and ever increasing disguises and refinements, the more modern idealistic and philosophic view of the universe. It is seen in the obscure unfathomableness from which Böhm makes the being of God emerge, and comprehend Himself in the Son, as in His heart; so that in this self-comprehension He is first called God, 'not, however, according to the first *principium*, but cruelty, wrath—the stern source to which evil bears witness, pain, trembling, burning.'¹ Its course is next traced in the earlier system of Schelling; evil being therein regarded as that higher power, inherent in the dark groundwork of nature, which comes forth in actual life; its necessity being asserted, and the contrast between nature and spirit, between darkness and light, viewed as the contrast between good and evil. Even according to Hegel, the ideal is in a state of declension in nature; the absolute, the natural, condition of man is evil, the creature has an unhappy existence. Finitude, humanity, and abasement are said to be identical, and are considered alien to that which is simply God, and, as such, destroyed by the death of Christ. The exaltation of Christ to the right hand of God is regarded as an explication of the nature of God returning to Himself, of God as spirit. This spirit manifestly gets rid of individuality as something alien, because it can still only view it as a product of nature, which is said to be the self-alienation of the ideal. Even Hegel's opinions concerning physiognomy, prove that he did not comprehend the importance of individuality. He views it as finitude, limitation, deficiency; hence spirit must get rid of it to be reconciled with itself. But is it not the very opposite of deficiency, even that infinite definiteness of spirit, which is a condition of personality? This Manichæan shadow forms also that philosophical obscurity, that warped and dualistic principle, which is found in Strauss's Life of Jesus, and on which the several conclusions of that work are founded. Here the dualistic separation between the ideal and reality is a chief premiss (see pp. 68 and 69). From this premiss arose that brilliant phrase which

See Baur, *die Christliche Gnosis*, p. 560.

was one day to attain to world-wide celebrity, as a test of the absence of presentiment in religion, viz., that it was not the custom of the ideal to lavish its fulness upon an individual, and to be niggardly towards all others. According to this saying, individuality is at best but a stronghold in which the ideal is confined, and whence it cannot come forth, till, like magic powder, it has burst its prison-walls. Hence it cannot be raised to the pure ideality of the spirit, nor pervaded by its fulness, because the boundary lines which circumscribe the individual, are regarded as limitations of the spirit. This is the most refined attainment, the highest effort of dualism; hence its necessary complement must be Pantheism, which regards the universe as a foaming ocean, and beholds its God involved in its ceaseless tides.

The assertion that the rites of the ancient Hebrews were a worship of Moloch, has been maintained with ever increasing boldness.¹ The truth is, that the Hebrews had to maintain a continual struggle, by means of the revelation and law of Jehovah, who as the eternal God stood in opposition to the process-God, in order to free and purify themselves from heathen traditions of the worship of Moloch. Jehovah commanded Abraham to offer up Isaac; he was willing to make the sacrifice; but, in the decisive moment, he understood the command as if Moloch had said to him, Slay Isaac. Then Jehovah interposed, praised his obedience, corrected his error, and taught him the difference between the two acts, *surrender* and *death*,—bidding him slay the ram as a sign that he surrendered, *i.e.*, sacrificed, his son. Abraham showed not only by the *strength of mind* with which he responded to the voice of God when commanding sacrifice, but by the *clearness* with which he understood the voice of God when explaining sacrifice, that he was the elect one, whom the Lord had need of for the founding of a theocracy, in which the life of man was to be continually sacrificed to Him, but in which no human being was to be slain through guilty priestcraft. Thus the Old Testament gained a victory over the worship of Moloch, even in the case of Abraham, though it had still to resist and subdue the backsliding of the people into this false religion. And how can this backsliding astonish us, when we see that philosophy has not yet succeeded

¹ Daumer, *der Feuer- und Molochsdiens der alten Hebräer*; Gillany, *die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer*, and others.

in entirely freeing itself from Chronos, when it still considers it the highest attainment of the religious spirit to regard individualities as sacrifices, which must fall before the process-God? This Pantheism cannot endure the idea of the God-man, of the pure consecration of the divine-human consciousness merging itself in the eternity of God. If Christ be comprehended as eternal personality in God, it is manifest during time that God has ever been comprehended in Him as personality. But if this God-man performs miracles, what is this but manifesting the entrance of higher and still higher circles and spiritual forms into the old world; exhibiting the government of God in the foundation and centre of the world, and thereby abolishing the assumption that the Divinity is ever lost and ever found again in the ever uniform course of things? The world then ceases to appear an endless stream; it discloses itself as the wondrous flower, in whose blossom may be discovered the eternity which brought it forth. The dynamic and organic relations of the world's history, according to which Christ forms the deep centre, the outweighing counterpoise to the whole human race, and regulates the whole course of the universe as its stable centre, according to which He elevates glorified humanity, as His one Church, to the eternity of His spirit, are relations of a sublimity unattainable by the view which makes the greatness of mankind to consist in its masses. It is even incapable of understanding Christ's death upon the cross in its moral significance, as the reconciliation of the world, arising from the voluntary surrender of Christ to the justice of God, and can only regard it as an event naturally developed in the series of necessity. But the resurrection is the rock on which Pantheism suffers shipwreck. That spiritual and divine heroism, that sense of eternity, that inspiration of personality, which shows its consciousness of its eternal dignity by testifying to the certainty of the resurrection, lies far above its conceptions. Its spirit arises from rashness, and proceeds to rashness, over that Faust-like magic bridge of subjective life which it hastily constructs, and again destroys. That such a view of the world should seek, with all the energy of its nature, to destroy, by a critical attack, the actuality of the Gospel history, lies in its very nature. Christianity, however, finds this criticism criticised by the unspirituality of its principles. A philosophy not yet freed from the worship of Chronos,

cannot sit in judgment upon the history which put an end to the sway of Zeus. But that this formerly vanquished view of the world has been able to attain a relative authority in our days, must have been caused by the morbidity of the view of the world prevailing in the Church. If Christian theology and the Christian view of the world have misconceived the omnipresence of God in the world, and resolved God's elevation above the world into a terrible and abstract absence from it, the rise of the opposite extreme is thereby sufficiently explained. When, further, the ideal, the general, was ever more and more lost in the single facts of the Gospel, and these were regarded as mere past and isolated facts, which faith was to preserve as historical dicta complete in themselves, it was a just retribution that pantheistic criticism should, on its side, no longer acknowledge the actuality of the Gospel ideas. This criticism, however, has attacked not only false views, but the Gospel history itself, and has in this respect itself become the critic of its own deficient and antiquated principles.

Mutilated dualistic Monotheism, under the form of the Jewish hierarchy, brought about the crucifixion of Christ, because it was perplexed by a Messiah, in whom the fulness of the Godhead was united with a real, a poor, and a homely human life. Talmudism subsequently carried on this criticism, and expressed itself by defamation of the Virgin¹ and abhorrence of the 'executed One,' and by a deep hatred of the Gospel in general. Even Mohammedanism criticised Christianity, especially the doctrine of the Trinity, from the point of view of a deistical faith, assuming the abstract unity of God, His exclusive super-mundanism and super-humanism, and the self-contained absence of His being from the world.²

Deism also was forced to modify its expressions concerning the personality of Christ, and the Gospel history in general, as soon as it entered and took up a position within the Church of Christ. Ancient christianized Deism, as chiefly implanted in the Church by converted Pharisees, appeared under the form of Ebionitism, which denied the eternal glory and divinity of

¹ Compare Strauss, *Leben Jesu* i. 227.

² Compare Geroch, *Christologie des Koran*, p. 74. The Koran assumes that, according to Christian teaching, Jesus, and Mary His mother, were placed as two Gods (Allahs) near to Allah (Sura v. 125).

Christ, opposed His miraculous conception, and looked upon Him as the actual son of Joseph, while it honoured Him as the last of the Old Testament prophets, the reformer of Israel, endowed with the largest measure of the Spirit for the execution of His work. Ebionitism in its Jewish narrowness gradually fell, like a withered branch, from the tree of the visible Church, but the Deism on which it was founded, continued to agitate the ancient Church under more elevated and more profound forms. It appeared in the whole series of Monarchians, who had this common feature, that they all denied the essential Trinity of the Godhead. They embraced, like Noetus, the doctrine of Patripassianism; or, like Sabellius, the doctrine of a merely triple form of manifestation; or, like Arius, a new development of Polytheism,¹ rather than plunge into the depths of the doctrine of the threefold glory of God. In other words, they could not free themselves from the deistic view of the abstract unity of God.

This Deism is also perceived in the system of Nestorius,² so far as it misconceives the ideality of the human personality of Christ, prepared for throughout the whole history of the human race; while the opposite systems of Eutychianism and Monophysitism could not attain to the full recognition of the human reality and historical truth of this personality, and were consequently perplexed by Gnostic errors. Nestorian as well as Gnostic notions have in disguised forms been secretly amalgamated with Christian views, especially with such as regard the incarnation of Christ as merely a part of His humiliation, and consider it a positive arrangement of God with a view to the redemption of mankind.³

¹ In Church histories of Arianism, Arius indeed, as a believer in subordination, is represented as opposed to the Monarchians, but it is easy to perceive that subordination, especially the subordination of Christ, well agrees with the monarchy of God.

² The Nestorian terms, *συνάφεια* and *ἐνοίκησις*, to define the manner of the union of the divine and human natures, express the immediate and merely external meeting and union of the two natures of Christ. Adoptionism also belongs to the same group.

³ If it were agreeable to Christian truth to look upon the incarnation of Christ as part of His humiliation, His exaltation must consequently be either represented as depriving Him of humanity, or as obscured by the continuance of His humanity. The passage Phil. ii. 7, *ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορ-*

This abstract Monotheism took a more philosophic and definite form in modern Deism, which is for this reason more definitely so called. The Deist looks upon the universe as simply nature, as a work of God, separate from Himself, purely natural, and self-sustained. He considers that God, in His omnipotence, caused the existence of the world to depend upon that conformity to law which He imposed upon it; that He so strictly bound it to a rigid conformity to law, as Himself to seem constrained and limited by the constraint He had laid upon the universe. In his system, conformity to law usurps the place of God's active government, and seems to be a second divinity, separate from Him, and causing Him, while reposing in that absolute supra-mundanism which is the celestial counterpart of a monkish renunciation of the world, to leave it to the perpetual correctness of its own movements. As, however, conformity to law cannot really work as a second divinity, a divinity in the world, it rather becomes, in the religious consciousness of the Deist, a shadow obscuring the living God, a partition separating from Him. This evil result cannot but follow from the fact, that the universe, even in its motions, is seen by him under a narrowed, an impoverished, a mutilated form. It is not the actual world, with its infinite variety, its continual progress from lower to higher grades of life, its refined and spiritual conformity to law, agreeably to which the ordinary appearances of the lower spheres of life are ever being broken through and laid aside, amidst miraculous phenomena, by the principles of the higher spheres of life, which furnishes him with the facts upon which his theory is formed. His view rests rather upon a compendium of natural philosophy, which has elevated the elementary principles and definitions thereof to eternal statutes. It confounds these statutes of a dead compendium with the living laws of the world, the formula which designates the phenomena with the phenomena themselves, empiricism operating upon common every-day remembrance with the infinite objective reality. The Deist is specially taken with the false assumption, that the development of the world

Φῆν δούλου λαβών ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, does not denote the incarnation of Christ independently considered, but its historical certainty, that He took the form of a servant, that in His forbearance he was like to (sinful) man.

exhibits a single æon, ever moving onwards amidst unvarying results, as upon an interminable railroad between an inconceivably distant commencement, and an as inconceivably distant termination. He does not form a conception of progress from æon to æon in an advancing series, resulting from the introduction of higher, deeper, and richer vital principles, and least of all, of the appearance of that principle, in the midst of time, which eternalizes temporality, transforming the restless course of its unending line into the solemn movement of a circle returning upon itself. The shortsightedness, prejudice, and enmity with which Deism has, on its subordinate principles, criticised the facts of Gospel history, are well known.¹ In modern Rationalism it has striven to ennoble itself, has taken a more Christian form, and has endeavoured to make better terms with the high reality of the Gospel history. But even Rationalism radically failed, because the inconceivableness of the abstract monotonous unity of the Godhead, the necessity of the Trinity in Unity, the living light of the personality of God in its self-manifestation, had not yet risen upon it. Hence, in its interpretations of Scripture, and delineations of the life of Jesus, it has ever employed a criticism more or less betraying an Ebionite point of view. Even in the days of the Apostle John, the influence of these extraneous heathen principles was manifested in the critical opinions uttered against the heavenly reality of the divine-human life of Christ. The apostle proclaimed the deity of Christ, in opposition to incipient Ebionitism (1 John iv. 15); the truth of His humanity, in opposition to incipient Gnosticism (1 John iv. 2). But mixed forms, especially the system of Cerinthus, soon resulted from the elective affinity of these extremes, and frequently reappeared.²

In our own times, the Gnostic element, under the form of modern cultivation, has shown its old critical antagonism to the great ideal reality of the Gospel history in Strauss's *Life of*

¹ English Deism, in its practical results, viz., critical attacks upon sacred history, was specially introduced with the sensualistic philosophy of Locke. Comp. Lechler, *Gesch. des Engl. Deismus*, p. 154, etc.

² Philo may be cited as an example. As an Israelite, he could not be a complete Gnostic; nor, as a Platonist, a complete Israelite. By his assumption of the eternity of matter, he stood below the Old Testament, while thinking to stand above it.

Jesus ; the Ebionite element, under that of modern scholarship, has expressed the same antagonism in the Life of Jesus by Paulus. The work of the former has, indeed, assimilated many elements belonging to the latter point of view ; indeed, the latest productions of antagonistic criticism can scarcely be reduced to any, not even to heathen principles.

An intelligent view of the principles of antagonistic criticism exhibits their connection with those dark powers of heathen natural life, which Christianity criticised, *i.e.*, sentenced and conquered in the Gospel history. If they regain any influence within the Christian Church, notwithstanding their former overthrow, in their original forms, this is a consequence of special compounds and relations in the sphere of spiritual life. A venerable and respectable Pharisaism will often obtain consideration in the presence of rank Antinomianism ; while, again, the idealistic spiritual aspirations of Gnosticism will gain fresh favour when orthodoxy stiffens into mere lifeless precepts. The facts of the Gospel history had long been treated by the Church in a rigidly positive manner, and regarded rather as dead marvels than living miracles ; their vital power, and innumerable vital relations, being misconceived,—their ideality, unappreciated. It was ordained that the stiff rigidity in which the living pictures depicted in the Gospel history were held by such a view, should be broken up by the electric shock of a partial and Gnostic treatment.

NOTES.

1. The common principle of every possible product, both of naked extra-Christian Heathenism, and of broken up and christianized Heathenism, is ungodliness, impiety : impersonal Atheism, with respect to the subjective view ; Materialism, with respect to the objective appearance. Atheism trembles to admit that solution of the problem, the government of God in all reality ; hence its product is Materialism, the unspiritual substance. Materialism is the refuse of the world, heaped up before the door of indolent Atheism. The measure of the one is the measure of the other. The heathen system, to be understood in its specifically heathen character, must be viewed on this side, *viz.*, that of its impiety. If, on the contrary, it is viewed, as is usual, only in its piety, which, as a morbid and super-

stitious piety, corresponds with its impiety, it is difficult, fundamentally, to refute it. For example, it is not so easy, when contending with the fire-worshipper, to dispute the beauty and magic power of fire, as to show him how erroneous it is to regard water as a God-forsaken mass. The temple-worshipper feels, when within his fane, a divine awe; it is, so to speak, the asylum of his delusion; but it is in its profane environs that the Erinnyes of criticism must attack him. The Pantheist feels himself happy in contemplating that divine afflatus which breathes through the universal; but he must be shown that he is unhappy in the presence of that great glory, the majesty of the eternal conscious Spirit, whose ever-powerful and conscious unity makes the universal, independently considered, to vanish into nothing. It must be proved to him that his system, in wanting a definite God, the eternal spiritual consciousness of God, has too little of God; not, as seems to have been sometimes thought, that it has too much of God. The Deist boasts of maintaining the unity of God. But if he is forced to acknowledge the absolute darkness which lies in the notion of an abstract unity of God, and also to confess the blackness of darkness proceeding from the rigid mechanism of an universe left by God to its own laws, he is on the road to recognise that the unity of the eternal God cannot be conceived of, in its vitality, without the form of Trinity.

2. Gnosticism has this peculiarity, that it can only form schools and not churches, because it knows only morbid ideals, which can never become flesh and blood; a transient summer of the divine, which can never become the sun of the personal Godhead. Its chief characteristic is antagonism to the accomplished realization of divine government. Hence the Gnostic systems also must be simply viewed and arranged according to their polemic relations to the Old Testament doctrine of creation, to the real advent of Christ in the Old Testament, and to His incarnation in the New, and according to the development of these relations. Consequently, even Manichæism must be regarded as only a potentialized Gnostic system. With regard to Gnosticism in general, the thesis may be laid down, that there is no Pantheism which does not include dualism, no dualism which does not include Pantheism. The Pantheist finds the existence of an evil being, first, in general finity; next, in human sensuousness;

lastly, in the human feeling of dependence, *i.e.*, in religion. Dualism is continually betraying its Pantheism, by its inability to maintain the precise line of demarcation between the kingdom of light and the kingdom of darkness. Darkness comes forth in the kingdom of light, and the lost germ of light is again sought in the kingdom of darkness ; this confusion is the sign of that pantheistic somnolency which overcomes the heroic efforts of dualism.

3. Every form of Deism has the peculiarity of regarding the existence of the world as a trivial reality, as the great *tout comme chez nous*, which need not be surrendered to the all-ruling Godhead ; while Gnosticism makes the actual world a terrible sacrifice, to be consumed upon the altar of the ideal, like sin itself ; nature, a declension from the ideal ; individuality, limitation ; the features of the countenance, a caricature of the spirit, haunting the world ; personality, the selfish Sunday child which will not accommodate itself to the perpetual process of the dialectic railroad ; the historical Christ, ideality niggardly of its abundance, the ideal in oppressive majesty ; and, lastly, the Gospel history, the high land which opposes a granite-like resistance to the overwhelming stream of idealistry, and will not in its volcanic character surrender itself to the process which would convert it into one of the sedimentary deposits of mythology.

4. As the vampire is said to be nourished by the blood which he sucks from the living sleeper, so does dualism derive its triumphs from the blood of the Church herself, when she has fallen asleep over her riches. If, for instance, the ideality of the Gospel history had been always duly estimated, its reality could never have been so sadly misconceived ; and if its reality had been more powerfully proclaimed, criticism could not have attempted to convert its ideality into scraps of wonderful New Testament grammar. Dr Paulus' view of Gospel history is done away with by Dr Winer's New Testament Grammar. If the real grammar can do so much for the ideal theology, how much more must the real theology be able to do for it !

5. The warning of the Apostle Paul, Col. ii. 8, applies here : *βλέπετε μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγωγῶν διὰ τῆς φιλοσοφίας καὶ κενῆς ἀπάτης κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν. ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν*

τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, (through the philosophy, namely, which is formed) after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ (which does not look upon Christ, but upon elements, atoms, matter, as the principle of the world). For in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (in the unity of the bodily appearance). For so would I translate and explain this passage.¹ Thus the apostle is contrasting, with all earnestness, the philosophy founded on the assumption that the elements are the principle of the universe, with the philosophy which recognises Christ as the principle of the universe, and that, not as if delivering a discourse, but speaking of it in its proper meaning, both in a Christian and speculative manner. This philosophy arose from human, *i.e.*, heathen tradition, and did not overcome Heathenism. It was, at first, rightly called philosophy, as being the sincere effort of the human mind to attain to knowledge; but now that it would maintain itself in opposition to the philosophy which is after Christ, it became vain deceit. And they who would impose it upon Christians, spoiled them, deprived them of the infinite riches laid up in Christ, and chiefly of the certainty that in Him the fulness of the Godhead, and the most decided individual corporeity, became one. While Christian philosophy—which is not mere philosophy, because it goes beyond abstractions, and presses on from life to life—recognised Christ as the eternal principle of the universe, this miserable philosophy, which makes Christians poor, looked upon the elements as the principle of the universe. Here, then, we find the materialism of the heathen view of the world resolving itself, before the eye of the philosopher, into atoms or elements. These float before his view like dark *mouches volantes*, which he cannot perceive to be caused and arranged by the ideality of the great and spiritual principle of the universe, and are seen, in consequence of a defect of spiritual vision, in

¹ [Virtually the same interpretation is given by Tertullian (*De Præscrip. Hæret.* c. 33): ‘Apostolus, cum improbat elementis servientes, aliquem Her-mogenem ostendit, qui materiam non natam introducens deo non nato eam comparat, et ita matrem elementorum deam faciens potest ei servire, quam deo comparat.’ But a full consideration of this and all the other passages which bear upon the Gnostic heresy will be found in the *Bampton Lectures* for 1829.—ED.]

mutual interaction with the so-called 'dark seed' of sinfulness, especially of moral spiritual bondage. The ascetic precepts of the teachers of error at Colosse (Col. ii. 16, etc.) showed that they were founded on Gnostic, consequently on dualistic principles. Even these precepts are *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* (Col. ii. 20; Gal. iv. 3, 9); and are consistent with the theoretic assumption of the world-forming *στοιχεῖα*. The profane sense, which looks on the world as profane, must be brought back by the strictness of the precept to a feeling for what is holy, that it may discover the principle of what is holy, that principle which both theoretically and practically sanctifies the world. By this allusion, the apostle seems to have been led to designate even the Israelitish precepts as *στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου*.

SECTION V.

ANTAGONISTIC CRITICISM IN ITS DIALECTIC DEALINGS.

An interest for Christianity is an interest for reality itself, and therefore one with the spirit of truth. True Christianity knows nothing of partiality. The history of the apostles gives repeated instances of this Christian elevation of mind; *e.g.*, in the narratives of the ruin of Judas, the fall of Peter, the deceit of Ananias. The cause of Christianity is therefore never served by deceitful arguments. But neither can perfect truth be attacked continually from opposite stand-points. Its distortion may contend with the distortions of other ages; inhuman Christianity and unchristian humanity, monkery and philanthropy—phenomena which contain their own refutation—may for a long time contend with each other, but *one* aspect of pure truth cannot oppose another. Consequently, when Christianity, as realized truth, as incarnate ideality, meets with an inconsistent criticism of its records, it may be expected that the deception of the antagonistic principle will soon develop itself into a web of deception in the execution. Modern antagonistic criticism cannot conceal this feature. An unprejudiced criticism of this criticism cannot but more and more bring to light the thread of special pleading, running through all its operations. Such a method of proceed-

ing has indeed been frequently provoked by the equally morbid partiality, with which Church theology has endeavoured to reconcile the discrepancies of the four Gospels. When Church notions pursued their course without opposition, the doctrine of inspiration was carried to such an extreme, that not only the whole Bible, but every letter of the Bible, was made a Christ of. The infallibility of the four Gospels was viewed as excluding every uncertainty and inaccuracy in each single narrative. One result of this false assumption was the so-called harmony, *i.e.*, an attempt to bring all the Gospels into perfect agreement with each other, even in minute details. But harmony shot beyond the mark. The false assumption led to a false execution, to artifices in exposition which were carried to the extremes of special pleading. Church theology, however, was punished for the faults committed by this well-meant harmony, by a three times more powerful antagonistic harmony. The presumption, that as the commemorative saying is repeated in lyric poetry, so what is most important in history may also be exactly repeated, as, *e.g.*, the cure of the blind at Jericho, the purification of the temple, may always be pleaded in favour of the former harmony. Antagonistic harmony, on the other hand, has laid down terrible canons.¹ The Gospel narrative must, above all things, be in harmony with ordinary reality. If the fact it relates has a glimmer of ideality, if it inclines to the miraculous,² if it is pervious to the ideal, and thus symbolical, it is therefore suspicious.³ This applies especially to the ethic sublimity, the moral and religious dignity, with which the Gospel history exhibits its facts.⁴

¹ Compare Ebrard, *Gospel History* (Clark's Tr.), p. 47, History of Harmony. Ebrard has well shown that Strauss proceeds upon the principles of an exaggerated harmony, antagonistic to the Gospel history.

² 'God acts upon the world as a whole directly, but upon its several parts only by means of His agency upon other parts, *i.e.*, by the laws of nature.—The miracles which God wrought for and by Moses and Jesus, are not emanations from His direct agency upon the whole, but presuppose a direct action in particular cases, and are, so far, in opposition to the ordinary type of divine agency in the world.'—Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 97.

³ Certainly truth must be the foundation of a universal anticipation and notion; yet this truth will not consist of a single fact exactly corresponding to such a notion, but of an idea realized in a series of facts often very dissimilar to such a notion.—*Id.* vol. i. p. 237.

⁴ As neither an individual in general, nor the commencing point in an historical series in particular, can be at the same time archetypal; so, if

It is the superiority of the Gospel history to the ordinary reality of common life which, according to antagonistic criticism, makes its historic truth suspicious. Facts consequently increase in improbability, in proportion as they surpass the circle of the empirically natural, the real, and the common. The second harmony which this criticism requires, is the agreement of the several Gospel reporters in the details of their narrative. The Gospel records are to bear the impress of lawyer-like exactness, and to prove themselves to be protocols, stating the external facts of circumstances, with perfect care as to the reception of detail. And in proportion as they want the qualities of protocols, as they fail to give to matters the form of a judicial process, are they to be regarded as untrustworthy.¹

The first of these requisitions fundamentally denies the very principle which makes the Gospels, gospels. For they have no facts to relate which can be easily fitted into the empiricism of the Adamic æon, but the facts of that new principle of ideal-real humanity, whereby the miraculous breaks through the old sphere of nature, the eternal and spiritual light shines through human corporeity and reality, the majesty of perfect righteousness appears in the reality of a human life—a life surrounded by a retinue of moral heroes whom it calls into being, contending with the demoniacal powers which oppose it, and savingly and judicially pervading the old and sinful human nature with its effects. If the weak mind, giddy and stunned by such an announcement, betakes itself to crossing and blessing before this principle and the heroes it produces, it is at liberty to do so; but when it finds fault with the details of that which is so mira-

Christ be regarded decidedly as man, the archetypal nature and development which *Schleiermacher* ascribes to Him, cannot be made to accord with the laws of human existence.

¹ Compare Tholuck's *Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Gesch.* p. 438. The author is humorously enumerating the canons upon which Strauss's *Leben Jesu* is founded. The fifth is called 'The Castor and Pollux canon—in which the one of two contradictory narratives by its very existence excludes the other, and is in its turn shaken by the rejection of the other.' Even the agreement of two Evangelists is not to defend the credibility of their statements. Both Matthew and Luke affirm that Jesus was born at Bethlehem, and yet the critic, from the sum of their statements, obtains the result, that Jesus was not born at Bethlehem, but most probably at Nazareth. Vol. i. 327.

culous, symbolical, and holy, it is committing itself to the criticism of the principle, while deluding itself with the idea that it is but criticising the accounts of its operations. This critical requisition for the agreement of the Gospel narratives with the old empirical reality, the true critic will, as a Christian, feel bound to reject. But the second requisition he will reject as a historian ; for it would either drive every genuine historian to despair by its results, or rather, hinder him by its absurdity. This demand ignores from the very first the fact that the Evangelists are relating history, and therefore a series of facts, which, having been already reflected in the subjective spiritual life of the narrators, can no longer be had in the form of an abstract chronicle, nor converted into one. It falls into the further error of forgetting that the Evangelists relate religious history ; a history which they did not compose and arrange with a view to the requirements of the scientific, but of the religious interest, nor propagate for the furtherance of a partial scientific knowledge, but rather for the purpose of communicating to others, or at least of increasing in them, that same life which they had themselves found in these facts.¹ Finally, this requisition misconceives that which is most important, viz., that these narrators relate Christian history, and therefore facts which in their very nature could not but assume a fresh aspect in each mind according to its individuality, while they yet remain the same, because they are the facts which are to explain the general life in the individual, as well as the individual in the general. The historian must not fail duly to appreciate the co-operation of the historical spirit, especially of the religious spirit, nor finally of the Christian spirit, first, in the original facts of the history, and secondly, in the manner of its narration. He must not be condemned to write merely the history of nations, when he is chiefly concerned with heroes, and even with the greatest heroes ; and if he is to understand the circumference of history, he must be allowed to grasp its centre, and to contemplate it from this point. The sway exercised by this false premiss over the works of antagonistic criticism is expressed in a mass of separate sophistries, whose connection therewith does not always at first strike the eye. Arguments are often pleaded before the bar of Gospel

¹ 'It is well to observe that we have not before us a history of religion, but a religious history.'—Gelpke, *die Jugendgeschichte des Herrn*, p. 2.

criticism which would not pass uncensured, much less prevail, in any civil court. Some practices have already become standing figures. Among them, for instance, is the plan of considering the Evangelists stupid; understanding their words in the most literal manner, and assuming that they were incapable of intentionally narrating anything paradoxical, imaginative, or symbolically significant. Thus it is asserted that Luke, the disciple of Paul, makes the Lord, in an Ebionite sense, declare the blessedness of the poor, as simply poor;¹ that John puts a false word into Andrew's mouth, when the latter says, 'We have found the Christ,' since he did not purpose to seek the very person of the Messiah;² that the Synopticians make the Redeemer give a hint to the Pharisees that He is not to be regarded as a descendant of David, by asking them the question, how David could call the Messiah his Lord (Ps. cx. 1) if He were his son (Matt. xxii. 42; Mark xii. 36; Luke xx. 41).³ This plan is, however, reversed as occasion requires, and the critic seems to undertake the part which the Evangelists have just been made to play: now he cannot form a notion of their meaning, can often find no connection in their compositions, or finally, only some lexical connection, *i.e.*, a word in one Gospel saying reminds the Evangelist of a similar word in another Gospel saying, and induces him to report it. Thus the lexical, *apropos*, the worst of all, is said to be the reason of many of those transitions in the Scriptures which have for many centuries appeared to the Christian mind the most subtle product of inspired thought during the

¹ Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 640.

² Bauer, *Kritik der evang. Geschichte des Johannes*, p. 46.

³ Weisse, *Evang. Geschichte*, vol. i. p. 587. According to this view of this striking passage, Christ gave the Pharisees a clandestine intimation of His origin by giving them to understand that He was not descended from David. Such an intimation would assume a very intimate relation between Christ and the Pharisees; it would further assume that the Pharisees already took Him for the Messiah, and also that He believed they would esteem Him to be the Messiah, even if they perceived from His intimation that He was not the son of David; and finally, that the Messiah could not descend from David, because the spirit of prophecy had already repudiated this notion in the psalm. How can so many follies be put *at once* into the mouth of Him who ever spake that which was right, for the sake of making 'an *apperçu*'? The '*apperçu*' is, however, quite good enough to glide into some half-dozen theological works.

apostolic age.¹ At length, however, antagonistic criticism comes boldly forward with its pretensions to an infinite superiority to the Evangelists. One is praised—he is said to be highly poetical; a second and a third are censured—their words strike the critic as strange; a fourth is branded as a designing, glaring, unholy writer, a coarse falsifier of what is sacred, and condemned as a criminal. It is in the latter position that St John stands with respect to the critic Bruno Bauer.² Thus does antagonistic criticism, which seemed to begin its task in so cool and tranquil a disposition, and with such entire freedom from assumptions, finish by taking up its genuine position, and exhibiting that passionate moral and religious abhorrence, in which it takes a final leave of the Gospels. Such a termination manifests the nature of its origin and progress, and exposes the moral vein running through the whole process,—the antagonism of its principle to the personal incarnation of God, and its holy results. Bold and direct assertions and coarse accusations form the appropriate climax of such a conclusion; for a false principle ever follows up its other practices with effrontery sufficient to complete their work.

NOTES.

1. A collection of examples of the sophistical dealings of antagonistic criticism might here be adduced, to complete the proofs already given. We can, however, only refer to the principal works of this kind, and to the numerous examinations of them. Tholuck, in his often cited essay, has repeatedly pointed out the sophistry of Strauss's work. With regard to the special

¹ The proposition may be laid down as a principle, that in every production of criticism the critic is comparing his own standard with the subject to be measured, his sense with the sense to be estimated. All criticism is so far a contest, nay, a wager. The critic, in the pride of his intellectual power and authority, says, *e.g.*, of such a passage in the Gospels: I do not understand this passage. In this case, either the Evangelist must be far below him, or he must be far below the Evangelist. But if at last he gives it as his decided judgment, This is only a lexical connection, what is this but uttering the exclamation, *va banc*, with respect to the book criticised? The credit either of the book or of the critic, with respect to religious and moral intelligibility, is now destroyed.

² See Bauer's *Kritik der ev. Geschichte der Synoptiker und des Johannes*, vol. iii. p. 185.

treatment of the history of Christ's childhood, examples of the kind in question are brought forward in my essay, *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter der kanonischen Evangelien*. The most striking specimens must, however, be sought in the criticism 'which goes beyond' Strauss. Certainly 'criticism,' in its last stage, has become the *partie honteuse* of modern science.

2. There are many who, in the field of theological discussion, and especially of scientific criticism, entirely repudiate such a proceeding as 'putting to their consciences' the results of their inquiries. This strange decision, rightly understood, exhibits the intention of setting up a scientific priesthood whose dicta are by no means to be impugned. For the very essence of priestcraft consists in the separation between the moral character of the individual and the spiritual calling which he fills. The spiritual calling is thereby made a spiritual *métier*. The ecclesiastical priest declines having his decisions 'put to his conscience;' the scientific priest declines to have the result of his inquiries referred to the roots of his opinion, his moral principles. A consistent man, on the contrary, would feel it an offence if his scientific work were not regarded as the product of his mind, and in agreement with his conscience. He would look upon it as an honour, that the moral significance of his conclusions—their relation to the deepest interests of the heart, to the highest principles, should be recognised, and that his works should be regarded as the acts of worship arising from his personal religion. According to the Christian principle, that the inner life must possess a unity of character (Matt. vi. 22; Jas. i. 8), the Church must, once for all, repudiate the recognition of this priestly dualism, which would make the man of science as distinct from his works, as the butcher is from the animal he slaughters. Even modern philosophy opposes this violent separation of the intellectual and the moral man. Kant rebuilds the whole world of knowledge, which he had destroyed as resting upon itself, upon the solid foundation of the conscience; Fichte makes the deciding Ego the very centre of gravity in the sphere of knowledge; Hegel finds everything, and especially religion and morality, in the reasoning power. With such premises, how is it possible to protest against the relations of the reason to the conscience? It is only possible in the cowardly stage of antagonism. When the disease reaches

the stage of effrontery, it openly avows the connection of its critical operations, with its enmity to Christianity.

SECTION VI.

ANTAGONISTIC CRITICISM, IN ITS INTERMIXTURE OF CONTRADICTORY ASSUMPTIONS, AND OPPOSITE MODES OF TREATMENT.

Unquestionably, it is but a natural mental operation, that the Gospels should be viewed, tested, and opposed, from each of the above described pre-Christian or inter-Christian points of view. Nor can the right, and even the duty, of every man to test the Gospel records, according to his power and calling, from a Christian point of view, by bringing them to certain formal and essential axioms, and judging them accordingly, be questioned. With respect to their form, inquiry must be made how far they are self-consistent, in accordance with each other, and with the known character of the times to which they refer. Whatever discrepancies appear, are set down against them; but while their credibility, in essential matters, would be weakened by essential discrepancies, it can only be strengthened by non-essential ones. The essential matter, however, judging from their tendency, is everywhere to narrate only the Gospel, that is, the history of Jesus in its religious significance and effects. With regard to the axioms of Christian criticism, the Gospel narratives must be homogeneous with the essential definitions of the Christian view of the universe. The general Church recognition of the God-man, of His life, ministry, death upon the cross, resurrection, and ascension, must form the principles, according to which the matter of the Gospels must be tested. These axioms, *e.g.*, instantly bring to light the difference between the canonical and apocryphal Gospels;¹ and where they lead to the discovery of weaknesses, failings, and blemishes in evangelical narratives, their decision must be followed, regardless of consequences. Criticism is fully justified in taking either of

¹ Compare Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit*, p. 106; Ullmann, *Historisch oder Mythisch*, p. 181.

these opposite points of view: the antagonistic, or that arising from the Christian view of the world. But matters are changed when they are deceptively and obscurely intermingled. When criticism designates the annihilation of Christian theology, Christian theology; and, while professing to proceed only according to the principles of formal criticism, will, in the midst of the argument, admit of none but those antichristian axioms from which it originates, thus rushing from affected surprise into decided antagonism, it has even more reason than Wallenstein to exclaim, 'The ambiguity of my life accuses me.' A procedure might indeed be imagined, which should exhibit a combination of the two points of view, without falling under this reproof: An individual might write a criticism of the Gospels from some one or other religious feeling of his own, in which, from the very first, he would have regard only to the relation in which the consequences of the Gospel history would stand to the dicta of this feeling. In this manner, every one who approaches the Gospel history, enters into a process of exercising his criticism upon it, and in his turn experiencing its criticism of himself. The philosopher may, if he will, criticise the Gospel in detail, according to his professed system. He is not expected to judge it by any other than his own. But it will better become him to betake himself to principles, than first to lose himself in the discussion of particulars. A criticism of the Gospels, however, professing to be theological, or, in other words, to be mere criticism, naturally leads us to presume that it will judge of the Gospels according to their own premiss, viz., the truth of Christianity. Upon this ground only has it a right to enter into matters of detail; such, *e.g.*, as the religious consciousness of Jesus at His twelfth year, the spirit of His farewell discourse, etc. But if it seeks, from the first, to demolish this premiss, attacking it in its details on every opportunity,—if, from the first, it suffers non-Christian axioms to regulate its proceedings,—it forfeits all claim to indulgence in particulars, and all pretence of judging and testing the Gospels in that Christian spirit which, as such, should judge and test all things. When once the antagonistic relation is established, this complication disappears. The discussion is then carried on in the sphere of religious philosophy, and outside the gates of the sanctuary. The deep matters, such as the subject of connection in the Gospels, which only the Christian spirit can solve, and

which must remain hidden from non-Christian views, are no longer discussed. It will then be regarded as even unscientific to enter into particulars with adversaries who contest principles. Modern antagonistic treatment of the life of Jesus should have been answered by dogmatism. If a lawyer had been commissioned to reply to the sophistical analysis of the details of the Gospels, how easily might a lawyer-like reply have been found to these lawyer-like attacks! Nay, perhaps, a master of his art might, in conducting the cause of the Evangelists, have succeeded in exhibiting, in the style of their adversaries, a connected protocol out of all their several accounts. This much is, however, plainly manifest from the above described intermixture of critical starting points, that theological criticism, as such, is still in its infancy, and that the first step to be taken, should be an attempt to develop the principles of criticism itself, to bring the instrument into conformity with its ideal, that it may not be employed as a mongrel kind of proceeding, between judicial execution and private assassination, in an uncertain and destructive manner, producing nothing but the most perplexing illusions.

NOTE.

The two well-known titles—*The life of Jesus* critically treated—and *Christian Doctrine exhibited in its historical development*, and in its opposition to modern science—have often been mentioned as characteristic indications of such an intermixture of opposite critical points of view. The compositor would have more accurately exhibited the peculiar relation between what is acknowledged and what is denied in these titles, if his italics had distributed the emphasis thus: *The life of Jesus, critically treated*—*Christian Doctrine, etc., in its opposition to modern science.* The title ‘The Lord’ seems strangely introduced in the critical works of Bauer, in the midst of an attempt to consign to destruction the glory of His works. In the third volume, indeed, it gradually disappears, and the name of Jesus takes its place.

SECTION VII.

THE CHRISTIAN THEOLOGICAL CRITICISM OF THE GOSPEL NARRATIVES.

A course of argument which proceeds upon no definite principles, or upon principles not decidedly those of the Christian point of view, can by no means be brought forward or recognised as theological criticism. Many works making pretensions to this title, have been characterized by their denial of the principles of Christianity, the principles of historical criticism, and even the principle of being consistent with themselves. Every utterance and evasion of subchristian or antichristian assumption, every sophistry and chicane employed in the examination of the Gospels, has been called criticism. To lay down an organon of criticism, is therefore of the first necessity.

It has been laid down as the first principle of criticism, that it should be entirely free from assumption. Freedom from assumption has even been said to be criticism. Hence a more accurate definition of this notion may reasonably be demanded. The requisition that the critic should not allow himself to be influenced by preconceived opinions, is quite another from that which demands that he should not start from Christian premises. It is, however, too indefinite to settle anything satisfactorily. This freedom from assumptions is never found as a gift of nature, for even the most mindless of men has his interests. If he has no holy, he has unholy interests, because he is a man, a being whose inner nature can never sink or stiffen into absolute indifference. The most indolent exhibit some kind of party spirit, and even the despairing are destroyed by the fearful power of false assumptions. It is only when moral and religious development has reached its climax, that a kind of energetic freedom from assumptions can appear, which is then, however, identical with the most sublime assumption. For it is not till man clearly recognises that pure reality is identical with truth, that he attains the courage and joy which enable him to look upon the facts he is investigating in a purely objective manner, and to perceive that truth will gain most by an utter renunciation of the selfish interference of his own special interests, by a complete

surrender to the divine, in its naked reality. Thus man does not become free from assumptions till he assumes that truth appears in reality. But this is, in fact, the assumption of the eternal truth of Christianity; namely, that the ideal is realized, not merely in myths, but in facts; that the God-man must be manifested, not merely in scattered reflections, but in the plenitude of individuality and personality. It is in this fundamental dogma that Christianity appears as the religion of the spirit. Hence Christianity is identical with objective criticism, and the Christian spirit, as such, is free from assumptions, because it consists in the highest assumption, and *vice versa*. Absolute freedom from assumption then, is, in the relation of a vital contrast, one with absolute assumption, and this contrast, in its oneness, forms the chief principle of Christian criticism. Its results are not merely a series of absolute critical propositions, but of absolute critical acts. Partial freedom from assumption, on the contrary, is more or less unconsciously connected with the partial assumption, that a perpetual schism exists between spirit and nature, between truth and reality, an abyss between Godhead and manhood, which can only be filled up and covered over by artifices fitted to either of these requirements. Hence it looks upon reality as a world infected, in its very nature, with illusions. This low-pitched and false assumption begets, as has been seen, a criticism after its own kind. The first principle of true criticism, however, is the conviction that the actual world unfolds truth, and that truth is exhibited in facts, the highest truth in the highest fact. Hence arises the general requisition, that the critic should test the matter in hand with a morality corresponding to this conviction. He is seeking truth in the object he is testing; he must therefore approach it with truth. Generally speaking, truth is the absolute connection, the conformity of the particular with the whole, and with the infinite. But in the province of criticism, truth exhibits itself in a definite succession of incidents. First, the speech or expression is self-consistent; this is its logical truth. Then the saying is consistent with the inner nature of the person speaking; this is its moral truth. Further, its conformity with already accredited testimony is apparent; this is its historical truth. Finally, the saying is in accordance with the Eternal, as manifested in the heart of every man, and expressed in the

life of the holy ; this confirms its religious truth. In all these respects, it cannot but be required of the true critic, that he should himself be in accordance with truth, that he should be truthful, or 'do' the truth, as St John expresses it, in order to pass judgment concerning the truth of the matter to be tested.

Thus what criticism demands in its object, it must first exhibit in its own transactions. It must be true, to be able to demand, to appreciate, to test truth. Criticism of the Gospels demands of the Gospel which it is testing, first, that it should be consistent with itself. The Evangelist may indeed, nay must *appear* to contradict himself. For the *appearance* of contradiction is the mark of life, depth, and concrete vigour. Nature *appears* to contradict herself a thousand times. If the critic finds a difficulty in this appearance of inconsistency, if he requires of the Gospels a lawyer-like accuracy of expression, he does but proclaim his own inability to appreciate them. He may, however, and must expect them to be free from real contradictions. The measure of their logical consistency is but the measure of their credibility. Such a consistency is the first demand of the critic. But it is therefore also his first duty. If he contradicts himself,—if, for instance, he at one time designates the dulness of the narrative, and at another its picturesqueness, as tokens of its unhistorical nature, if he at different times applies different and mutually opposing rules of judgment,—he forfeits all claims to the credibility upon which he seems to proceed.

Logical uncertainty may be the result of enthusiastic delusion. It may, however, be connected also with moral uncertainty. Detailed testimony always makes a moral impression : the person who speaks is always apparent in the background of the speech. It may be perceived from the relation of the whole to the parts, whether the highest force of conviction prevails, or whether the speaker is endeavouring to persuade himself as well as others. When, then, logical inconsistency appears, on closer observation, to be moral inconsistency,—when, for instance, a hesitation between the dictates of holiness and immoral expressions is apparent,—the moral trustworthiness of the speaker is doubtful. The critic examines him in this respect. He may condemn him if he betrays decided inconsistency between his sayings and his moral nature. But he is himself subject to

the same law. If he is continually showing himself prejudiced, while laying down entire freedom from prejudice as a principle,—if, *e.g.*, he insists on seeing anecdotes in myths, or myths in anecdotes, while it is the nature of the anecdote to be sharpened by the occasional, and of the myth to express the ordinary, if he applies diverse weights and measures to differing passages, according to the requirements of his special judgment,—the spirit of the critic has become his possessing demon, which is powerfully rending him in the midst of the process.

In communications of a historical kind, criticism investigates their historical truth, by considering their relation to already acknowledged testimony. Historical truth must, first of all, be distinguished from the truth exhibited by a legal document or a protocol. The latter must exhibit the utmost completeness in the description of an event, the former a lively and spirited view and comprehension of it. The legal reporter endeavours to transcribe an occurrence with the greatest possible accuracy, though even this cannot be accomplished without the co-operation of the mind's interpretation. The historical narrator, on the contrary, draws a free and artistic portrait of the circumstance; he tries to exhibit its essential features, as they have mentally affected himself. History is the actual world viewed and exhibited in the element of the mind, of enthusiasm, of the ideal. A protocol-like history will never descend to posterity; it is only by means of the joint testimony of the ideal, that pictures of the world's history can retain their brilliancy to the world's end, and to eternity. This peculiar nature of historic truth seems to make history utterly uncertain, and does make it uncertain to every man who is only susceptible of the kind of evidence furnished by natural science. But that which makes it uncertain in this respect, is the very circumstance which, on the other hand, constitutes its certainty, *viz.*, the epic spirit with which it is allied. The human mind obtains its highest conviction, concerning such distant and ancient occurrences as are narrated to it, by epic, or, as it might with equal propriety be called, moral assurance. History does not, however, therefore become a mere subjective delusion. The objective credibility of historical testimony is one of the most unshakeable convictions of the human mind. But the relative degrees of this credibility form an endless multitude of historical paths, which entangle the un-

candid mind like a labyrinth, while the candid mind finds the brightest traces of truth to guide it. The relative degrees of certainty correspond with these relative degrees of credibility. There are certainties of ancient times, which shine through all time, like the stars, nay like the sun and moon in heaven. But as soon as the special features of generally certain facts are treated of, the special views both of the witnesses and the recipients of their testimony are apparent. The general historical image appears under infinitely various modifications, according to the position and disposition of the minds that perceive it. The Thirty Years' War assumes one colour in the eyes of the Protestant, another in the eyes of the Catholic. The Englishman talks of the battle of Waterloo, the Prussian of the battle of La Belle Alliance; it is *one* battle, but each nation has its special interest in the more defined conception and description of it. If, then, differing stand-points produce differing views of the same occurrence, the essential and non-essential must first be distinguished, unless all historical truth is to be despaired of. But not only will the view formed of an event depend upon the spirit in which it is contemplated, but this view will be also infinitely modified by differences in the means by which knowledge of it is obtained, by the circumstances of nearness or distance, and especially by the individuality of those who consider it. The variety of historical images which the same event will impress upon different individuals will, however, be the more striking in proportion as the event itself is, on one hand, more important, copious, and significant, and, on the other, as the individuals who report it are original and significant. But among all varieties of outline and colouring, the historical narrative must, when tested, present in all essential matters the same image as other accredited testimony presents: this is its historic truth. The critic must require historic truth in a narrative. But to require this, he must possess the historic sense. He must have the ability of becoming assured of distant events by means of the historic spirit; the power of transposing himself into the past by means of the perpetuity of moral divination; and sufficient delicacy of perception to discern between the objective matter of a narrative, and its subjective setting. If this sense is wanting, he will either, with superstitious submission, identify all the witnesses of a fact with the fact itself, and thus, *e.g.*,

make out of two different representations of one occurrence, two separate histories; or he will, with historical incredulity, require that history should be everywhere accredited by its lawyer-like accuracy, that its truth should be officially and juridically established.

Finally, since the Gospels announce that which is ever valid in the sphere of religious life, the facts which they relate must correspond with the religious consciousness, in those respects in which it is in all ages alike. The critic may, and must test the religiousness of the narratives as well as of the facts. Hence arises the necessity that he should address himself to his task in a religious spirit, with a sense for the holy and the eternal in mankind. But the religiousness of the Evangelists announces itself as Christian in its nature. Does it become the critic then to test such witnesses, nay, the facts themselves which they narrate, with respect to their Christianity? Such a task seems both difficult and dangerous. But yet it was once accomplished by the primitive Church, when consciously forming the canon. In this case, the standard is always the collection of the New Testament Scriptures, as formed by the mind of the Church into a definite unity, or, in other words, the Christian spirit as originally and normally defined by the Sacred Scriptures. It is, for instance, entirely in accordance with a due relative subordination, that the Christianity of Mark, the disciple of the apostles, should be tested by the Christianity of apostolic teaching. But the critic who should feel himself called to this examination, must, on that very account, be a Christian. If he is deficient in Christian faith and spirit, he is deficient in the spirit of criticism—of criticism at the climax of its glory. The criticism of the Gospels must always cultivate and develop these principles, and carry on its work according to their dictates.

PART V.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

SECTION I.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL CORROBORATION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS IN GENERAL.

ONE of the noblest branches of ecclesiastical tradition is the tradition of the four Gospels. It appears in a threefold form : first, as testing and accrediting the Gospels, and investing them with ecclesiastical validity ; then as preserving, propagating, and expounding them ; and finally, as laying them down as the rule and touchstone of the Christianity of all other ecclesiastical traditions. It is only the first form of this tradition which will here engage us, viz., the attestation furnished to the four Gospels by the ancient Church.

Three stages may be discerned in the progress which this attestation exhibits. First, we find that, even in the middle of the second century, four Gospels, far surpassing all others in value, were known to the Christian Church. Then we learn from witnesses of the latter half and close of the same century, that the Gospels, known as the four Gospels, must have been the same that have been handed down to us ; while towards the close of the third and commencement of the fourth century, we find these Gospels recognised by the Church in a very decided manner.

Justin Martyr (A.D. 165) and his disciple Tatian may be taken as representatives of the position in which the Church stood to Gospel literature. The former was born in Palestine, and died in Rome ; hence he was acquainted with the Church in a tolerably extensive circuit. The same was the case with Tatian, who belonged to Syria, and returned thither from Rome after Justin's death. Now Justin, in his dialogue with Trypho the

Jew, repeatedly appeals to original written testimonies, which he designates the memoirs or memorabilia of the apostles (*ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων*). He views them both in their connection with and contrast to the writings of the prophets (*τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν προφητῶν*); that is, as a collection of writings, known and acknowledged by the Church, together with the Old Testament canon. As much that is found in the four Gospels is introduced in this dialogue, it is probable that he included these among the memoirs he mentions.¹ He speaks, indeed, also of a Gospel, but this is quite in accordance with the feelings and expressions of the Church, and signifies the one objective Gospel, pervading all the subjective representations admitted by the Church. That Justin was acquainted with these also is evident, for he calls the memoirs *Gospels*.² When, then, the connection in which Justin and Tatian stand with each other is taken into account, we cannot but connect the memoirs appealed to by the former, with the Gospel writing composed by the latter. After the death of Justin, Tatian was led aside by the Gnostic tendencies then rife in his native place, and from which he probably had not before been entirely free. It was under this influence that he composed his work the *Diatessaron* (*διὰ τεσσάρων*; out of four, or according to 'the four').³ As a Gnostic, he found many causes of offence in the Gospels handed down by the Church, which he intended to remedy in this composition, in which he omitted the genealogies of Christ and all passages relating to His descent from David. If Tatian, then, could thus designate his authorities, it is plain that in his days four Gospels must have been universally known and acknowledged; and how can it be supposed that these were any other than those known to his master Justin? Thus, in the middle

¹ [Eichhorn (represented in England by Bishop Marsh) denied this conclusion, but it has since been put beyond all question by Semisch and by Winer (Justin evan. canon. usum fuisse ostenditur, 1819). The argument is briefly but conclusively exhibited in W. Lindsay Alexander's *Christ and Christianity*, pp. 50-60 (1854). Above all, however, see the very thorough investigation by Westcott, *Gen. Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Test.*, pp. 105-199 (1855).—ED.]

² Apolog. ii. Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἀ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, etc.

³ Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* iv. 29 : ὁ Τατιανὸς συνάφειάν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν εὐαγγελίων συνθεῖς τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν.

of the second century, there were four Gospels, known as the four, decidedly looked upon as valid in the Church; and, according to Eusebius,¹ these were the same four as those acknowledged in later times. Eusebius, however, was not acquainted with Tatian's work, and might therefore have been mistaken as to its reference to our four Gospels. But Theophilus of Antioch (A.D. 181) was also acquainted with four Gospels; and these must have been identical with ours, since Jerome was acquainted with commentaries on our four Gospels, which he attributed to Theophilus.² In his work, *ad Autolycum*, B. iii., Theophilus speaks of the agreement between the prophets and Evangelists on the doctrine of justification; and this combination shows also the high degree of consideration which must have been awarded to the Evangelists in his days.

The testimony of Papias, who was Bishop of Hierapolis about the middle of the second century, and is said to have suffered martyrdom under Marcus Aurelius, offers many difficulties concerning the Gospels. Papias, as it appears, has said (as reported by Eusebius in his *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 39) nothing concerning the Gospels of St Luke and St John. To this matter, however, we shall hereafter have to recur. Of St Matthew he says, that he wrote the λόγια (the oral Gospel) in the Hebrew language, which every one interpreted to the best of his ability; of Mark, that he committed to writing what he learned of the Gospel, as interpreter to Peter. Both these accounts will have to be considered when we treat more particularly of these Evangelists. Thus much is, however, certain, that Papias was acquainted with one Gospel attributed to Matthew, and another attributed to Mark. But why does he not mention the Gospels of Luke and John? It almost seems as if the answer to this question might be gathered from a closer consideration of the report given of his expressions by Eusebius. According to this, Papias made a collection of the oral traditions concerning our Lord,³ in five books (συγγράμματα πέντε λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεως). In the preface to this work, he explains the man-

¹ See Note 3, on preceding page.

² Comp. Kirchhofer, *Quellensammlung zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Canons bis auf Hieronymus*, p. 45.

³ For the justification of this translation, see the section on the authenticity of St Matthew.

ner in which it was composed. He tells us that he did not concern himself with the communications of those who delivered new and strange precepts, but inquired after such as received what they delivered from the Lord Himself. 'And if,' continues he, 'there came a disciple of the elders, I investigated the sayings of the elders: what Andrew or Peter had said, or what Philip, or what Thomas or James, or what John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples; *then also what Aristion or the presbyter John, the Lord's disciples, say.*'¹ Eusebius employs this passage in opposition to Irenæus, who had said that Papias was a disciple (hearer) of John, and a companion of Polycarp. He remarks upon it, that Papias here twice introduces the name of John, the first time in connection with the apostles, the second in connection with Aristion, and designates this last John as the presbyter, thereby confirming the tradition of those who distinguished John the presbyter from the apostle of the same name, and maintained that the separate graves of both were still to be seen at Ephesus. But Eusebius overlooks the fact that Papias also calls the apostles elders. It also escapes him, that Papias might here well introduce the name of John the apostle or presbyter twice, once as receiving his communications at the hands of his disciples, as he did those of Andrew or Peter, and again as receiving them directly, like those of Aristion. It is also necessary to remark, that John the presbyter is also decidedly distinguished from Aristion, both being called disciples of the Lord, but the title of presbyter being given to John alone. Was, then, Aristion, the disciple of the Lord, no presbyter according to the meaning attached to this word by the more modern church of Eusebius? In the days of Papias, the title presbyter, used in connection with an apostolic name, had still a special import in the Church. Papias first speaks of communications which he derived directly from the disciples of the Lord. He was then, in any case, in communication with such, whether their names were John, Aristion, or any other. He says, too, that he did not neglect *indirect* tradition, namely, such as he received from the disciples of the elders, *i.e.*, the apostles.

¹ Εἰ δὲ ποῦ καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ Πέτρος εἶπεν, ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τὶ Θωμᾶς ἢ τὶ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τὶ Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν· ἃ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν.

When mentioning this second and minor source of information, he seems to feel the necessity of accrediting it by the words: As also Aristion and John the presbyter, the Lord's disciples, say. These, then, furnish him the ultimate corroboration of what he had learned indirectly concerning the apostles through their disciples; they must therefore certainly stand on the same level with those whom he names as his first and best authorities. Consequently John the elder could be no other than John the apostle; and the very words of Papias, in spite of their being misunderstood by Eusebius, confirm the statement of Irenæus. If, then, we may translate the Latin name Luke into the Greek Aristion, which seems very admissible (*Lucere, ἀριστεύω*), we have this satisfactory explanation of the fact, that the testimony of Papias to the two last Gospels is wanting, namely, that in the cases of the Evangelist Luke and the Apostle John, Papias had their own oral communications in support of his exegesis, in place of their Gospels; and this is the more probable, since he was in possession of oral traditions, and it was a principle with him to prefer them to written narratives.¹ In the case, then, of Luke and John he did not inquire after written Gospels, though he did so in that of Matthew and Mark; while, with respect to the Gospel of the latter, he inquired also into its apostolic foundation. He was, in fact, according to the words of Irenæus, an *ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ*, an ecclesiastical ancient. If such a man mentioned the two first Gospels with a few critical remarks, and passed by the two last without comment, such a fact is a strong corroboration of all.

To the testimony of Papias, we join that of Irenæus (A.D. 202). He tells us, in his work against heresies (iii. 1), that Matthew brought out a Gospel among the Hebrews, in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching, and founding a church, at Rome: that after their departure, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, transmitted to us in writing what the latter had proclaimed: that Luke, the companion of St Paul, gave a written summary of the Gospel preached by that apostle: and that John also, the disciple of the Lord, who lay on His breast, composed a Gospel during his stay at Ephesus, in Asia.

¹ Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἐκ τῶν βιβλίων τοσούτον με ἀφελεῖν ὑπελάμβανον ὥσιν τὰ παραζῶσης φῶνης καὶ μενούσης.

Clement of Alexandria (about A.D. 221), in his *Stromata* (B. iii.), quotes an expression which Christ is said to have used in answer to a question of Salome, remarking, that this saying is not found in any of the four Gospels which have been handed down to us, but that it is contained in the Gospel of the Egyptians. He thus distinguishes the latter from the four Gospels, and looks upon the latter as exclusively and collectively regarded as valid by the Church. According to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.* vi. 14), he expressed himself (in his *Hypotyposes*) concerning the Gospels in the following manner:—That those Gospels were first written which contain the genealogies: that Mark, the companion of Peter in Rome, had, at the request of many, set down what Peter preached, and delivered it to them: that Peter heard of this, but neither dissuaded him from the undertaking, nor urged him to it; and that John, last of all, seeing that in all these Gospels that which was corporeal had been communicated (ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις δεδήλωται), and being encouraged by his friends, and impelled by the Spirit, composed the spiritual Gospel (πνευματικὸν ποιῆσαι Εὐαγγέλιον).

Tertullian, a contemporary of Clement (A.D. 220), also testifies to the authenticity of the four Gospels. In his writing against Marcion, he accuses him of having mutilated the Gospel of St Luke (B. iv. c. 2). He lays down the principle, that the Gospels are, one and all, supported by the authority of the apostles, arguing that, though there were among the Evangelists disciples of the apostles, yet that these did not stand alone, but appeared with, as well as after the apostles. He thus views the apostolical testimony as a whole, in which those parts which are weaker in themselves, viz., the writings of Mark and Luke, partake of the strength of the unquestionable authority inherent in those of Matthew and John.¹

Such was the strength of ecclesiastical authentication bestowed upon our four Gospels, even at the beginning of the

¹ Constituimus in primis evangelicum instrumentum apostolos auctores habere, quibus hoc munus evangelii promulgandi ab ipso domino sit impositum. Si et apostolicos, non tamen solos, sed cum apostolis et post apostolos. Quoniam prædicatio discipulorum suspecta fieri posset de gloriæ studio, si non adsistat illi auctoritas magistrorum, immo Christi, qui magistros apostolos fecit. Denique nobis fidem ex apostolis Joannes et Matthæus insinuant, ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant, etc.

third, and latter half of the second century. Their diffusion in the Church is also certain. Proofs of the early spread of the four Gospels in the Syrian church are afforded us by the fact, that they were known to Justin Martyr, to his disciple Tatian, and to Theophilus of Antioch. From the testimony of Papias, which is completed with respect to Luke and John by Irenæus, we obtain the voice of the Asiatic church, with which the Gallic was in communication. Clement (to whom may be added Origen, in his more frequent mention of the four Gospels) shows that, in his days, the Gospels were a special possession of the church of Alexandria, while Tertullian bears the same testimony with respect to that of North Africa.

The account given of the Gospels by Eusebius, in his *Ecclesiastical History* (iii. 24), may be regarded as the sequel to the tradition of the early Church concerning them. He tells us that Matthew, having preached the faith to the Hebrews, wrote his Gospel in his native tongue, when about to proceed to other nations; and that Mark and Luke, having also given forth the Gospels known by their names, John, who had hitherto confined himself to an unwritten announcement, resolved upon writing, for the purpose of corroborating and completing the three Gospels already in circulation; and that he completed them, chiefly with respect to the commencement of Christ's preaching and ministry, which had been passed over by the others. Eusebius, by confirming the last view, as one already allowed, certainly lays too much stress upon an unimportant difference, but his testimony itself is independent of this declaration.

In the time, therefore, of Eusebius, *i.e.*, in the beginning of the fourth century, the authority of the four Gospels was regarded by the Church as unassailable, and they were reckoned among those books of the New Testament to which no objection existed. Their ecclesiastical authority could only be enhanced by their being designated as component parts of the canon by the decisions of general councils, an authorization which they subsequently received, especially at the Council of Laodicea, in the middle of the fourth century.

Subsequent ecclesiastical testimony need not here be entered into. It only remains to consider the manner in which the four Gospels were regarded and estimated by the Church, as collectively a spiritual whole. Even Irenæus felt called upon to ex-

plain their relation according to its spiritual import.¹ ‘As there are four quarters of the heavens in the world wherein we dwell, and four winds, so are there four pillars of the Church which is spreading over the whole earth, viz., the four Gospels, into which the one pillar and support of the Church, the Gospel and the Spirit of life, divides itself, and, like four living spirits or winds, they diffuse on all sides immortal life, and reanimate mankind. The cherubim, whose appearance was fourfold, were their types. The first living creature was like a lion, denoting strength, dominion, and sovereignty. The Gospel of John answers to this figure; it represents the glorious and sovereign origin of Christ, the Word, by whom all things were made. The second was like an ox, denoting the ordinances of sacrifice and priesthood. Hence the Gospel of Luke has a priestly character; it commences with the priest Zacharias offering sacrifice to God. The third had the face of a man, plainly representing the human appearance of the Son of God. It is Matthew who proclaims His human birth and its manner, after having begun with His genealogy. The fourth was like a flying eagle, denoting the gift of the Spirit hovering over the Church. Thus Mark testifies of the prophetic spirit which comes from above, by referring to the prophet Isaiah.’ Though there is but a very superficial foundation for these allegories, yet ecclesiastical theologians continued to apply the cherubic forms to the Gospels. Athanasius, however, connected the human form with Matthew, giving to Mark the symbol of the ox, to Luke that of the lion, to John the eagle. Others endeavoured to introduce other combinations.² The following, however, which is that of Jerome, prevailed:—‘The first form, that of the man, denotes Matthew, because he at once began to write of the man. The form of the lion denotes Mark, the voice of the roaring lion of the wilderness being heard in his Gospel. The third, that of the ox, signifies Luke, who begins with the priest Zacharias. The fourth form, the eagle, represents John, who soars above, as on eagles’ wings, and speaks of the divine Word.’ This distribution of attributes is found also in paintings representing the four Evan-

¹ See Credner, *Einleitung in das Neue Test.* s. 55.

² [These may be seen in Suicer’s *Thesaurus*, s. v. ἐναγγελιστής. Trenchard has also devoted some interesting pages (p. 60) of his *Sacred Latin Poetry* (Lond. 1849) to this matter.—ED.]

gelists. The second and fourth hits of these interpreters are evidently happier than they were themselves aware. The lion, especially the Asiatic lion, which is here intended, is a striking representation of the vigorous, bold, and graphic peculiarity of Mark. The eagle well denotes the sublime spiritual flight of John, and his bold gaze at the sun of the spiritual world. But how inappropriate is the application of the man to Matthew, and of the ox to Luke, if we look away from the mere incidents on which Jerome founds his comparison! It is Luke who pre-eminently exhibits the absolutely pure and divinely powerful humanity of Christ, and the human countenance might well characterize his Gospel; while that of Matthew, who more especially proclaimed to the Hebrew people the promised Messiah, in whose blood they were to find the real atonement, would be more appropriately symbolized by the ox.

Modern exegesis may smile at such interpretations, as unprofitable trifling; and truly they do exhibit, as it were, the childhood of theology and exegesis. But one great confession of the ancient ecclesiastical theology, viz., that each of the four Gospels has its characteristic significance, which is often entirely wanting in modern critical exegesis, cannot be misunderstood. The Church has still more correctly discerned and exhibited these peculiarities in the order in which the four Gospels are arranged, than in these interpretations; for this order is in accordance with that in which the key-notes of the Christian life succeed each other, both in the apostolic band, and in the Church. Matthew represents Old Testament Christianity, Jewish Christianity in its purity.¹ His Gospel everywhere points to the fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New, and would perhaps in its very construction frequently reflect the ancient Scriptures. Mark exhibits the Church in its Petrine spirit; the contemplation of the Lord's glorious work and terrible sufferings, of the stirring incidents of His life, is its chief concern. Luke bears distinctly the impress of that emphasis with which Paul, and

¹ If early pure, apostolic, Jewish Christianity has in our days been identified with the Ebionitism which gradually appeared in its midst, this fact exhibits not merely a gross misconception of the spiritual glory of primitive Christianity, but also a great want of historical accuracy, which, even in view of the subsequently degenerate and mutilated state of Jewish Christianity, still distinguished between Nazarenes and Ebionites.

the Pauline spirit of the Church, proclaimed universalism, the grace which appeared unto all men, and which is peculiarly exemplified in the parable of the lost son. John is the last peculiar spirit in the Gospel series, and denotes that deep and hidden disposition of the apostolic Church, which, because it was the deepest, was the last manifested in its historic development: he is the representative of that spirit which finds its happiness in losing itself in the contemplation of God in Christ.

NOTES.

1. Church tradition with respect to the four Gospels has been neglected, and even contemned, in the transactions of modern criticism, in a manner which would never have been suffered in the sphere of profane literature. [See Isaac Taylor's *Transmission of Ancient Books to Modern Times*.—ED.]

2. The well-known and ingenious view of Schelling, according to which the Apostles Peter, Paul, and John exhibit types of three successively developed forms of the universal Church, is supported by the order of the four Evangelists. But the type of the early Church would, according to this order, be severed in two. The patriarchal or orthodox Church would be the first type, represented by Matthew, who connects the Old with the New Testament, as that Church did the ancient ways of the world with the new life of Christianity. The Catholic Church would be the second; its representative is Mark. The common key-note of both is certainly expressed by the peculiarity of Peter. In these typical views, indeed, only that which is truly Christian in each form of the Church is contemplated.

SECTION II.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE FIRST GOSPEL.

The Gospel, entitled the Gospel according to St Matthew, was unanimously attributed by the early Church to the apostle of that name, who, before his call to the apostleship, was a publican living on the shores of the Lake of Galilee (Matt. ix. 9). The most ancient testimony is that of Papias, Bishop of Hier-

apolis, who, according to the before-cited account of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 39), declared, when speaking of this Gospel, that Matthew first wrote it in the Hebrew language, and that every one translated or explained it to the best of his power.¹ From a mistaken view of this evidence, a doubt of the genuineness of this Gospel first arose, and it is from its true sense that a due estimation of this book must proceed. Pantænus, the founder of the Alexandrian catechetical school, found a Hebrew Gospel of St Matthew among the Christians of Southern Arabia, during a missionary journey (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v. 10). Irenæus also informs us (*advers. hæres.* iii. 1) that Matthew brought out a Gospel among the Hebrews, in their own language. Origen (according to Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 25), Eusebius (iii. 24), Epiphanius (*hæres.* 30, 3), Chrysostom (*Hom. in Matt.* i.), Jerome (*Catal. de vir. ill.* c. 3), and others, also assert the same fact.

This tradition is corroborated by the relation in which the Greek Gospel of St Matthew stands both to the Hebrew language and to the Old Testament text. With regard to the first relation, this Gospel is interspersed with Hebrew words and constructions. Important quotations from the Old Testament are generally not taken from the Septuagint, the current Greek translation, but are fresh translations of the Hebrew text.² Errors of translation, said to be found in the Greek text, seem, however, to have been somewhat arbitrarily discovered.³

* ¹ Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο. Ἡρμῆνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἡδύνατο ἕκαστος (Var. i. ὡς ἦν δύνατος ἕκαστος).

² See Credner, *Einleit. in das Neue Testament*, p. 75. [A very ingenious application of these quotations is made by Westcott, *Introd.* p. 208. He says that they are of two kinds, those quoted by Matthew himself, and those woven in with the discourses of our Lord; and that the former are always original renderings of the Hebrew, the latter, in the main, agreeing with the LXX. This he thinks helps out his theory, that the Greek Gospel was not so much a translation as a substitute for the Hebrew, both having been current from the first as oral Gospels. The same distinction had been already made by Bleek, and is discussed by Ebrard, p. 524. Of the additions made by the translator, Davidson speaks, p. 47, vol. i.—ED.]

³ When *e.g.* it is asserted that Christ did not say, according to Matt. viii. 22, 'Let the dead bury their dead,' but, let other (men) bury their dead; viz., not מֵתִים מֵתִיהֶם, but מֵתִים מֵתֵיהֶם. [So good a judge as Wetstein has so little idea of errors in translation that he says, 'Nullum certe in nostro Matthæo reperitur indicium, unde colligi possit, ex alia in aliam

Schleiermacher, in his essay on the testimony of Papias (*Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, Jahrg. 1832), tries to prove that Papias only knew of a collection of sayings from Matthew, because the expression τὰ λογία could only mean sayings or discourses, and could not also be applied to actions. Lücke, on the other hand, shows that the words τὰ λογία are certainly used to designate a Gospel, comprising not only the sayings of the Lord, but also His deeds; adducing the fact, that Papias uses the same expression when speaking of the Gospel of St Mark, and employs the words τὰ λογία in the same sense as the expression: what Christ both said and did (τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα). It may also be remarked, that it would be a bold step for any grammarian so to limit the meaning of the expression τὰ λογία, as to cast upon the whole of the Greek Church (which certainly believed τὰ λογία and the present entire Gospel of Matthew to be identical) the reproach of being ignorant of the Greek language. It must also be taken into account, that Papias does not here define τὰ λόγια as τὰ λόγια of the Lord. He seems rather to use the word as a current one, and therefore independently. How very probable, then, is the supposition that, in his train of thought, this word might signify the oral communications of the Gospel history then current, in contrast to the written narratives. He tells us that he carefully investigated the words of the presbyters (τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λόγους). In this case the word in dispute would designate the Gospel history then still current in oral discourse (τῶν λόγων).¹ The argument of Schleiermacher is, at all events, untenable. In bringing it forward, it seems also to have been lost sight of, that by the composition of so partial a Gospel, a Gospel of sayings only, Matthew would but ill have corresponded with the vigour and copiousness required in an Evangelist and apostle. One of our modern abstract evangelists indeed, by whom miracles might be regarded as the suspicious matter from *linguam fuisse conversum; plurima vero aliud suadent.* Reuss (*Geschichte der Heil. Schriften*, p. 183) is of the same opinion.—ED.]

¹ [The readiest proof of the meaning of λογία is the title of Papias' own work, κυριακῶν λογίων ἐξήγησις, a work occupied with events as well as with sayings. For further proof, see Davidson's *Introd.* i. 66; or Ebrard's *Gospel History*, p. 527, note. One thing, however, is to be observed, that if Papias referred to Matthew's Gospel, then the Greek translation was unknown in his time, or at least to him.—ED.]

which he was to separate as far as possible the spirit of the words, in order to attain to the genuine or supposed sublimity of the Gospel, would, under the influence of such spiritualizing notions, according to which the Gospel fact, *the Word was made flesh*, has not yet been entirely fulfilled, have been more likely to hit upon the expedient of communicating, not merely separately, but exclusively, the sayings of the Lord. The whole argument, however, is overthrown by the fact, hereafter to be proved, that a deep and comprehensive unity is the foundation on which Matthew's Gospel rests. This unity is a pledge that in the Greek Gospel of St Matthew we possess, on the whole, a transcript, though a free translation, of the Hebrew. Since, however, tradition declares the original Gospel of this Evangelist to have been a Hebrew one, we must, with the certainty that a translation was made, concede the possibility of trifling emendations having been made also. Even Papias was acquainted with several versions, which did not all seem to satisfy him equally. It may, however, be supposed, that the better translations, and those most faithful to the original, were most in use in the Church, till that which was the best prevailed over the rest.

Sieffert and Schneckenburger have felt it incumbent upon them to attack the genuineness of Matthew's Gospel, on internal grounds.¹ First, the author is said to have been entirely ignorant of many things, which an apostle must have known. This conclusion is drawn from the incompleteness of his communications. But a like incompleteness might be charged upon each of the Evangelists, if they had bound themselves to afford a copious and verbally accurate representation of our Lord's life. This is, however, an utterly erroneous assumption. The second argument also, that the Evangelist has not reported successive events in their chronological order, arises from an erroneous assumption. For it is evident from the whole construction of this Gospel, that the Evangelist prefers such an arrangement of events as must naturally often break through the chronological order, and displace many occurrences. Hence there may arise

¹ See my essay on the authenticity of the four Gospels in the *Theol. Stud. und Kritik*. 1839, No. 1; Sieffert, *Ueber den Ursprung des erst. canon. Evang.* Königsberg 1832; Schneckenburger, *Ueber den Ursprung d. erst. canon. Evang.* Stuttgart 1834.

inaccuracies in the order of the narrative, but not in the matter of the events themselves. Thirdly, it is said that separate occurrences are combined in this Gospel, in a manner which is the fruit of tradition. The examples enumerated, however, would seem rather to prove the contrary; as, for instance, the supposed origination of a twofold miraculous feeding of the multitude, from a single event. In this case, however, it is taken for granted, instead of proved, that this miracle was but once performed. Besides, could inaccuracies occur in the description of an event at which the apostle, as such, must have been present? The mention of the foal which, according to Matthew, ran beside the ass, at Christ's entrance into Jerusalem, is said to have arisen from a misunderstanding of Zech. ix. 9. It is certainly possible that the translator might, in such particulars, have made additions which he thought improvements. Thus even a critical examination seems gradually to lead to this view,¹ and consequently to corroborate the testimony of Papias in the natural and correct meaning attributed to it before the explanation of Schleiermacher.

NOTES.

1. Ammon, in his *Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, vol. i. p. 53, etc., endeavours to identify the Gospel of St Matthew with the Gospel of the Hebrews, often named by the fathers. He says that the Hebrew Christians must have needed a short history of the life of Jesus, in their own language; and that, according to credible testimony, they were provided with one. 'It bore the name of the Gospel of the Hebrews or Nazarenes, and was attributed to the twelve apostles, but especially to Matthew.' A frequently corrected Greek translation, he says further on, banished the Aramæan original. 'This Hellenistic translation of the original Aramæan Gospel is included by Justin Martyr among his memoirs of the apostles, because it coincided with the early oral tradition of Palestine, and was first attributed exclusively to Matthew, when the appearance of other Gospels, representing respectively the views of Peter, Paul, and John, no longer suffered the names of the twelve apostles to be given to it.' Upon this hypothesis, it is inexplicable why the fathers

¹ Compare Kern : *Ueber den Ursprung des Evangelium Matthai*; *Tübinger Zeitschrift*; 1834, No. 2.

who quote this Gospel of the Hebrews, *e.g.*, Origen and Jerome, should so emphatically distinguish it from the Gospel of Matthew. It might also fairly be asked, why a Gospel of the twelve apostles, composed in a Jewish-Christian spirit, should, when it was afterwards found desirable to designate its author, have received the name of Matthew rather than that of James. Besides, the title *secundum Hebræos*, seems from the first to denote an apocryphal production. Hence the hypothesis is in every respect untenable.¹

2. Sieffert, in his above-mentioned essay, endeavours to prove the view frequently expressed by others, that Matthew, whose name is included in the apostolic catalogue, and whose call is related (Matt. ix. 9), is not identical with Levi, whose conversion is described by Mark (chap. ii. 13) and Luke (chap. v. 27). Levi is said to have received only a more general call, and not such a one as brought him within the apostolic band. This view is, however, very improbable. If Levi were formally called from the receipt of custom to follow Christ, as related by Mark and Luke—and if the same occurrence took place with respect to Matthew, according to his Gospel, and we afterwards find the name of Matthew in the list of the apostles, but not that of Levi,—it is most probable that Matthew was known by the name of Levi to the two Evangelists, who both relate the history of a conversion coinciding with his.

SECTION III.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE SECOND GOSPEL.

Mark John, or John Mark, a disciple of the apostles, who accompanied the Apostles Paul and Barnabas, and afterwards

¹ [The quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews collected in Append. D. of Westcott's *Introd.* prove that it was not identical with Matthew's Gospel; at the same time, they seem almost as distinctly to prove that the two were intimately related. This relation is determined by Ebrard, p. 527, but most ably and satisfactorily by Davidson, vol. i. pp. 12–36. And it may be added, that if the Aramaic original of Matthew existed in the latter half of the second century, only in the form of heretical, or at best, suspected recensions, then there is no difficulty in seeing how the Greek Gospel should have become the canonical, while the original was only ranked among the Antilegomena.—ED.]

Barnabas alone, on a missionary journey, who was subsequently the companion of Peter (1 Pet. v. 13), and is said to have suffered martyrdom at Alexandria, is very decidedly declared by the primitive Church to have been the author of this Gospel.

Papias, who refers the Greek Gospel of Matthew to a Hebrew original, also refers the Gospel of Mark to the oral preaching of Peter. He relates that, according to the communications of the presbyter John, Mark, the interpreter of Peter, committed to writing what that apostle delivered, not however in the order in which perhaps Christ spoke or acted, but in that in which Peter arranged his deeds and sayings, according to the needs of his audience. Schleiermacher supposes that this information shows, that Papias was not speaking of our Gospel according to Mark, which always preserves a chronological arrangement. But what John and Papias oppose, is not that this chronological arrangement existed, but that it was a historically correct one. Peter combined the sayings and deeds of the Lord according to his own views and the exigencies of preaching, and formed an order by this combination; and this is the foundation of Mark's Gospel, which, by this testimony, gains in apostolical what it loses in chronological authority. If John the presbyter had in view the order of John's Gospel, he might well declare of this collection of lifelike pictures from the life of Jesus, undivided into years, and omitting all notice of His ministry in Judea, that the original order (*τάξις*) had not been observed.

Irenæus gives a similar account of the origin of this Gospel (*adv. Hæres.* iii. 1). After the death of Peter and Paul at Rome, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, committed to writing what the latter had preached. Clement of Alexandria, however, says that even during Peter's ministry in Rome, Mark, at the request of many, took down much of what he delivered, and that Peter, when he heard this, neither specially assisted nor prevented him (*Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* vi. 14). Tertullian and Origen agree, in the main, with this account. According to the report of Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* ii. 15), Peter is said to have authenticated this Gospel, and commended it to the Church under the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

The universal recognition of the authenticity of this Gospel has not been extended to its conclusion (chap. xiv. 9–20), which, on both internal and external grounds, has been regarded as the

addition of a later hand. That Eusebius did not include this paragraph, is shown by his remark, that the passage in which the departure of the women from the grave is related, formed the conclusion in almost all copies. Jerome, Gregory of Nyssa, Euthymius Zigabenus, and others, express themselves in a similar manner.¹ The characteristic style of Mark is also wanting in this conclusion, his animated expressions, his repetitions, his use of uncommon and often Latin words; while peculiarities are found which do not belong to this Evangelist. It is, however, overstepping the bounds of caution, to reckon every creature (*πᾶσα κτίσις*), to speak with new tongues (*γλῶσσαις καιναῖς λαλεῖν*), and similar expressions, among them. If less regard were paid to such isolated expressions, many of which, in the record of a life so variously developed, might well make their first or only appearance in single passages, and more bestowed upon the general manner in which occurrences are viewed, and upon the change of scene in this paragraph, a different conclusion might perhaps be arrived at, with regard to internal evidence. The spiritual fulness and boldness of the promise with which Christ sends forth His disciples into the world, the strong expression *every creature*, and similar ones, seem quite in accordance with the style of this Evangelist.² It is also worthy of consideration, that Irenæus, who lived a century before Eusebius expressed himself as above mentioned, quotes the present conclusion of this Gospel (*adv. Hæres.* iii. 10, 6). The circumstance that, in the earliest times, some copies had this addition, and some not, may be explained by the supposition, that an incomplete work of Mark came into the hands of the Christian public before the subsequently complete one. In such a mark of quick execution and production, of sudden delay, and hesitation at a fresh chief incident, and of subsequent completion, the character of Mark, as known to us by many traits, is accurately reflected.

¹ See Credner, 106.

² [Yet it is difficult thus to account for twenty new expressions in half the number of verses. These are very fairly stated by Davidson, p. 169. Alford, whose judgment is here, as always, most worthy of consideration, thinks the internal evidence 'very weighty against Mark's being the author.' Ebrard adopts the not untenable hypothesis advocated by the author. If a considerable time elapsed between the two publications, this would sufficiently account for the change of style.—ED.]

SECTION IV.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

Luke, the companion of St Paul on several of his missionary journeys, and the author of the Acts of the Apostles, is also known to us as the writer of the third Gospel. He himself, in the opening of the Acts of the Apostles, refers to a Gospel of which he was the writer.

It must be conjectured that Tatian was acquainted with the Gospel of Luke, since he would hardly have sought to support his Diatessaron, or Gospel-harmony depending upon four Gospels, by an apocryphal production. We know, from the work of Tertullian against Marcion, that the latter was acquainted with this Gospel, which Tertullian reproaches him with having corrupted, because he found its more universal character, and its adaptation to Gentile Christians, make it more suitable to his system than those of the other Evangelists.¹ Irenæus reckons Luke among the four Evangelists; remarking that, as the companion of St Paul, he committed to writing the Gospel preached by that apostle.² Origen and Eusebius also designate him as the author of the Gospel which tradition ascribes to him. According to Eusebius, it was a current opinion, that Paul, when using the expression, according to my Gospel, intended thereby the Gospel according to Luke. Jerome (*Comment. in Isaïam* 6, 9) remarks, that the Greek education, which Luke had received as a physician, is apparent in his Gospel. The genuineness of this Gospel has been least opposed by critics, a circumstance owing, perhaps, to the fact, that the authority of this Evangelist is more easily attacked from a different quarter. Luke, as a Hellenist and a disciple of St Paul, had not such access to the chief mass of evangelical traditions as the other Evangelists. It was therefore more difficult for him, than for them, to obtain the Gospel treasure in its purity. But, on the other hand, he had, in the direction given to his mind by the teaching of Paul, a more developed feeling for certain aspects and incidents of the Gospel history. In any case, he had been so grafted into the genuine stock of primitive tradition by Paul, who lived in fre-

¹ Tertull. *adv. Marcionem* iv. 5.

² *Adv. hæres.* iii. 14, 1.

quent intercourse with the Church at Jerusalem, that the genuineness and purity of his communications cannot be disputed.

NOTE.

The question, why Luke is not mentioned by Papias, might perhaps find an answer in our previous remarks on his testimony. In favour of the supposition, that by Aristion, the Lord's disciple, named by Papias, we are to understand the Evangelist Luke, it may be remarked: (1.) That he connects Aristion with John the presbyter, whom he also calls the Lord's disciple; (2.) that he considers both as representatives of the oral tradition which he received from the immediate witnesses of the life of Jesus; (3.) that they appear, as such, to stand in a kind of contrast to Matthew and Mark, to whose written Gospels Papias appeals. According to the information of Isidore of Hispalis (*de ortu*, etc., c. 82), Luke died in his seventy-fourth year; according to a notice in the work of Jerome (*Catal. de vir. ill.* c. 7), supposed to be an interpolation (see Credner, *Einleit.* etc., 129), he lived till the age of eighty-four. If it were in his youth that he accompanied the Apostle Paul, he might, if he attained an advanced age, have been known by Papias as an old man, as well as the Apostle John; and in that case, he would, in conformity with his maxim, have concerned himself with his oral communications, and not with his writings. The preceding view leads to the information of Epiphanius, that Luke was one of the seventy, and to the remark of Theophylact (*Proœm. in Lucam*), that he was, according to the assertion of some, the unnamed disciple of the journey to Emmaus.

SECTION V.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The testimony given by the appendix of this Gospel (John xxi. 24, 25), declares that John was the disciple who testified and wrote what precedes it. We know that his testimony is true, say the witnesses. The genuineness, then, of this Gospel

seems to be avouched by Christian contemporaries. In our times the worth of such testimony has been, at one time, represented as quite decisive, at another, as utterly devoid of value.¹ A testimony accompanied by no signature, and forming an integral part of the matter testified, does indeed stand in a peculiar position. Such a testimony can have no direct value in our eyes; its force lies in the indirect value it obtained by the recognition of the early Church. The community of Christians, among whom the first copies of this Gospel were diffused, were delivered from all doubts respecting its genuineness by this decisive assurance, at its close. Doubt was, so to speak, challenged to make objections; and all possibility of this Gospel having been at first accepted for a period, without respect to its author, and gradually attributed, by a spurious tradition, to a mistaken origin, obviated. This testimony, too, acquires fresh weight in our eyes, through the Gospel with which it is connected. For, if it had not originated at the same place and time as the Gospel, it would scarcely be found in all copies, but would have been wanting in some, like the conclusion of Mark's Gospel.

It can be easily explained why this Gospel was at first more extolled by the Gnostics than by the orthodox Church itself. This church, for the most part, had not yet attained the power of entering into the spiritual views of John. It cherished and valued the treasure, but it was some time before it grew up to the full understanding and application of it. The churches specially edified by reading the Shepherd of Hermas, could hardly maintain a Pauline point of view, much less attain to that of John; and even when hellenistically educated theologians began to use this Gospel, it hardly became popular,—indeed it can scarcely be said to be so now. But the Gnostics had, from the first, a speculative tendency; and the eternal relation of God to the world was the leading question of their whole system. If John did not answer this question exactly as they did, this was only another reason why they would take possession of this Gospel, perhaps in the same manner as Marcion made unlawful use of the Gospel of Luke. Thus also did the Valentinians, according to the testimony of Irenæus (*adv. hæres.* iii.

¹ Compare Tholuck, *Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte*, p. 276; Weisse, *Die evang. Gesch.* vol. i. 99.

11, 7), lay violent hands on this Gospel. Heracleon wrote a commentary on it; and even the Montanists made use of it, not, indeed, merely on account of the promise of the Paraclete, which they referred to Montanus, but chiefly because this Gospel corresponded with the really sound fundamental principles of their tendencies. The fact that the Alogi attributed this Gospel to Cerinthus, proves how lightly they formed this opinion, since the well-known views of Cerinthus could by no means be reconciled with those of a work setting forth the incarnate and crucified Son of God. It may be supposed that it formed one of the supports of Tatian's Diatessaron, especially as he quotes from it in his *λόγος πρὸς Ἑλλήνας*, cap. xiii.

Though Justin Martyr does not mention this Evangelist by name, we find in his writings so many echoes of the style of John, and the doctrine of the Logos especially is made so emphatically prominent, that his intimate acquaintance with this Gospel cannot but be assumed. His whole point of view, which can only be explained by the fact of its being based upon the teaching of St John, gives silent but important testimony to its apostolic character. Christians in those days, indeed, equally relied upon the Shepherd of Hermas; but the brilliant popularity of this work never obtained for it a recognition as canonical, because a spirit of Christian criticism prevailed in the Church. It was this spirit which caused Justin's doctrine of the Logos to be esteemed apostolical.

Theophilus of Antioch is the first Christian author who, in quoting from this Gospel, names John as its author (*ad Autol.* ii. 22). Irenæus (*adv. Hæres.* iii. 1) makes John conclude the series of Evangelists which he mentions. He says that John, the disciple of the Lord, who lay on His bosom, himself produced this Gospel, while living at Ephesus. Himself, *i.e.*, in contrast to Peter and Paul, who caused their assistants, Mark and Luke, to write Gospels. He is followed by a series of fathers, who name John as the author of this Gospel, as Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius.

The Gospel of St John, though less intimately known by the majority than the other Gospels, was nevertheless regarded by the Church as the sublimest and most spiritual of all. The heart of Christ was felt to vibrate in it, and the conviction

that it was the work of John, the disciple who lay on the Lord's bosom, was a certain one. Hence the internal reasons for its genuineness were regarded by the early Church as unquestionable. The fact, then, that a series of critics should, in our days, have come to the conviction, that the internal nature of this Gospel gives rise to doubts of its genuineness, may be received as denoting an utter revolution of spiritual feeling. Bretschneider, indeed, suppressed his attack upon the authenticity of this Gospel, founded on arguments of this kind, in consequence of the effect produced by the replies. Strauss followed it up with alternately slighter and stronger doubts. He was followed by Weisse, Bruno Bauer, and others; and thus was formed a series, in which each "went beyond" his predecessors, in disputing the authenticity of St John's Gospel.

Strauss frequently expresses in his work his doubts of the authenticity of this Gospel, discrediting the genuineness of the discourses of Jesus therein recorded, when tried by the laws of probability, and of the retentiveness of the memory. On the strange uniformity of the discourses of Jesus, he prefers allowing others, whom he cites, to express themselves, while he himself brings forward more prominently the uniformity found in the replies of the Lord's Jewish opponents. 'The misunderstandings are not infrequently so gross as to surpass belief, and always so uniform as to resemble a standing manner.' Certainly it cannot be denied that the whole picture bears a strong impress of the style of John, who neither furnished, nor meant to furnish, a mere protocol. With respect to the constant recurrence of the misunderstandings, it may be observed, that it was one chief endeavour of this Evangelist to confirm by characteristic facts that general statement which he placed at the commencement of his Gospel: 'The light shineth in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not.' If the critic should find it strange that there should, in this respect, be 'no difference between a Samaritan woman and one of the most educated of the Pharisees,' we might refer to the universal character of this standing manner, prevailing, as it does, quite as much in our own days as formerly, and in which there is no difference between a Samaritan woman and a man of the most refined education.¹ Strauss here freely confesses that in many other

¹ Heb. xii. 3; 1 Cor. i. 21.

cases, both the objections of hearers and the replies of Jesus were perfectly consistent. With respect to the law of the retentiveness of the memory it may be remarked, that discourses brought forth as these are, in connected demonstrations and continuous dialogues, are just of the kind most difficult to retain in the memory and faithfully to report. Here, then, we cannot expect a strict line of demarcation between what forms part of the Evangelist's own mind and what is alien to it, nor an objectivity, properly so called. Such an expectation would involve an utterly false and unchristological assumption, obscuring the relation of an Evangelist to the Lord's objectivity. Certainly the assumption is of ancient date, being, in fact, that supernatural view, according to which an Evangelist is but the literal reporter of the words and deeds of Christ, unalterably impressed upon his mind. But for such an office, so choice an individuality as, *e. g.*, that of St John, and its sanctification, would have been unnecessary. The distinctness of his remembrance does not consist in the scholastic retentiveness of his head; his evangelical memory is identical with his inner life, his spiritual views, and especially with his evangelical love and joy. *A line of demarcation* between his own life and that which was 'alien,' or, correctly speaking, most germane to it, would have been here quite out of place. But, it may be asked, is the objective significance, the Christianity of his communications, rendered insecure by such a blending of his own life with the Gospel history? This would indeed be the case if we were obliged to own that John was unfaithful to his apostolic office, and had in any respect so brought forward the productions of his own mind as to give himself the greater prominence, and attract to himself the attention due to his Master. That this, however, is a view which cannot be entertained, has before been proved. There were, indeed, features in John's character in which he surpassed Peter, and all the other disciples, as also features in which he was surpassed by them; but that he should, in any particular, surpass Christ, contradicts the significance both of the Master and of the disciple; or that he, like Judas, for instance, withdrew one single element of the glory appertaining to Christ's power, entirely contradicts his apostolic character.

Hence the colouring which the objective Gospel of the Lord obtains from John's mind consists only in the form given by it

to the composition and illustration of the evangelical material with which it was penetrated. Through him the infinite richness of the life of Jesus displays new depths, presents a new aspect, and produces a new influence upon the world. It is incorrect to say that the sayings and parables of Jesus recorded by the other Evangelists were merely such as were more easy of retention. That which is most germane, most impressive to the individual mind, is at the same time most easily retained thereby. One mind will most readily remember numbers, another verses, a third philosophical formulæ; and it would be quite too idyllic a psychology to assert that the disciples, on the other hand, must have had a memory only for parables. Whence comes it, then, that the disciples of a philosopher know so well how to retain and use his formulæ? Can it be said, in an abstract manner, that these are retainable in this or that degree, and therefore this or that man retained them? Or may not the matter be better explained by attributing it to philosophical elective affinities? It would then be the christological elective affinity which caused John to 'retain' from the copious materials of the Gospel history that which was most retainable, nay, most incapable of being forgotten by himself.

When Strauss further finds it inexplicable that John should not have recorded the agony in Gethsemane, this is the result of his assumption, that this Gospel is a mere collection of memorabilia without any fixed plan. The assumption is, however, a false one. John had a definite idea to guide him in its composition, and it was his plan which led him to pass by this great conflict. His intention was to exhibit the glory of the suffering Redeemer in the presence of His enemies, in the whole series of those various incidents in which it was displayed. Among the demonstrations of this glory, however, His agony is not entirely omitted; its result, namely, that serenity of mind with which the Lord afterwards confronted His enemies, and which He had won in this struggle, being prominently brought forward. But this critic seems still more surprised, that John should, in the farewell discourse (chap. xiv.-xvii.), present the Lord to us as one who had in spirit already overcome the suffering which was still before Him; while, according to the synoptists, this tranquillity seems afterwards to have been exchanged for the most violent agitation. 'In the so-called priestly prayer (John xvii.),

Jesus had completely settled His account with the Father; all hesitation, with respect to what lay before Him, was so far past, that He did not waste a word upon His own sufferings. If, then, Jesus, after this settlement, again opened an account with God, if, after thinking Himself the victor, He was again involved in fearful conflict, must it not be asked: Why, instead of revelling in vain hopes, didst Thou not rather employ Thyself with serious thoughts of Thine approaching sufferings, etc.?' Perhaps the critic might have found in the lives of Savonarola, Luther, and others of God's heroes, analogies which might have led to a solution of this enigma. There is a great difference between complete victory over anxiety of mind, and complete victory over the natural feelings. In Christ's conflict, there is not a shadow of irresolution or uncertainty; the same mind *which in one Gospel utters the priestly intercession, in the others offers the priestly sacrifice*, in the words: 'Not my will but Thine be done.' But He brings it as a fresh sacrifice, streaming with the blood of unutterable sorrow. Did not Christ express this sorrow to His Father in that most pregnant saying: If it be possible, let this cup pass from Me! A further difficulty is also discovered in the fact, that John had previously described a conflict analogous to that in Gethsemane, viz., in the scene where certain Greeks, who had come to the feast, desired to see the Lord, and His soul is described as being deeply moved on this very occasion. Strauss is of opinion that the two synoptical 'anecdotes' of the agony in the garden and the transfiguration are blended in this one circumstance; and thinks John's representation strange, because Jesus is 'in the open day, and amidst thronging multitudes,' thus agitated, while he finds that of the synoptists, who represent this as occurring in the solitude of a garden, and in the dead of night, more comprehensible. It is, however, in the nature of a presentiment to be aroused by contrast. The dark forebodings of Cassandra are excited by the festivities and hymns of rejoicing in the palaces of Troy; and it is at the coronation, which she was the instrument of bringing about, that Joan of Arc is struck with this tragic sentiment. These fictions are entirely in accordance with the psychology of heroic tragedy, if not with the psychology of everyday convenience. Thus also Christ weeps over Jerusalem amidst the hosannas of the applauding multi-

tude. The feeling of security at mid-day, and of agitation during the darkness of the night, may be in keeping with the idyll, or with the domestic drama, but is out of place here. In one of Oehlenschläger's plays a candid cobbler declares, that at mid-day he is often so bold that he is actually obliged to put some constraint upon himself to believe in God ; but at night, in the dark forest, when the owls are hooting and the old oaks creaking, he could believe in anything that was required, in God or in the devil. Are we then to listen to the critic, and apply, in this instance, the standard of this magnanimous cobbler? Beside, the whole rhythm of this anxious presentiment is misconceived in the foregoing argument. Why should it not recur with augmented force? Is not such a recurrence quite in keeping with the higher and more refined regions of the world of mind? The shudder of terror, as well as other deep mental emotions, is rhythmical. Instead, then, of finding in the twofold recurrence of this foreboding, a mark of uncertainty in the narrative of John, the traces of this emotion in the Gospels should be carefully followed up, to see whether it may not still more frequently recur, as, *e.g.*, in the discourse with Nicodemus. Bretschneider asks, with reference to His priestly intercession, whether it is conceivable that Jesus, in the expectation of a violent death, could find nothing more important to do, than to converse with God of His person, His doings hitherto, and the glory He was expecting? In such a view, says Strauss, we arrive at the more correct notion, that the prayer in question appears to be not a direct outpouring, but rather a retrospective production ; not so much a discourse of Jesus, as a discourse about Him. It might be asked of Bretschneider, what then could Christ find to do more important? Bequeath a library perhaps, or set papers in order, or make His escape to Alexandria or Damascus? There is nothing here to help the cautious critic, to whom making a testament and making a New Testament is an immense contradiction. The mountain does not come to the prophet.

Willst den Dichter du verstehen,
Musst in Dichters Lande gehen,

is applicable to the prayer of the true High Priest and its reviewers. Strauss finds in it not a direct outpouring, but a retrospect. Is it to be wondered at, that feeling, in its perfection, should be vented entirely in thoughts? Or should the words

have been intermingled with the Ohs ! and Ahs ! of an enthusiast, lest they should seem only a retrospect ? Such reasoning is called forth by the old assumption of an irreconcilable antagonism between 'head and heart ;' but attention must be called to the infinitely acute understanding, the perfect reflection exhibited in the structure of a blossoming rose, the beautiful type of a mind glowing with love.

The leading idea of Weisse's argument against the genuineness of this Gospel, has been already cited and refuted. The supposed duplexity of the Christ of the synoptical Gospels and the Christ of John is an illusion. The ancient Church, in its intimate acquaintance with the subject, never perceived that double of the actual Christ, the John-like Christ, or Christ-like John of Professor Weisse. The view in question is connected with a multitude of erroneous assumptions. When it is said, for instance, that 'in the portraiture of Christ, as given in the synoptical Gospels, the mind of the Evangelist is a medium of transmission wholly indifferent, while in that of John it is a co-operative power in the production,' this assertion is entirely refuted by the fact, that each of the three first Gospels displays its own distinct peculiarity. Besides, according to this opinion, the synoptical portraiture of Christ would be a mere dull copy, that of John an artistic picture ; and it might well be asked which was preferable. But in any case, the representation of John would still be a *portrait* of Christ. Weisse, however, subsequently withdraws such an assumption. 'John gives us less a *portrait* than a *notion* of Christ ; his Christ does not speak *from*, but *about* His person.' But could He then not speak *from* His person *about* *His own* person ? Is the Christ who conversed at Jacob's well with the woman of Samaria, and wept at the grave of Lazarus, a mere notion—is this less a *portrait* than the Christ of the Sermon on the Mount ? Weisse also proceeds upon the view that the Gospel of John was composed independently of any settled plan. 'In fact, it appears from the uniform character of the discourses, not to mention the selection of the events narrated, so entirely devoid of plan, that no other explanation offers itself to the unprejudiced reader than the accident that these, and no other occurrences, came to the author's knowledge ; or, on the other hand, the equally accidental possibility of a connection of these, and no other nar-

ratives, with the matter in the possession of the author for the carrying out of his work.' The want of plan in this Gospel is only the assertion of the critic, which may, with equal or greater justice, be met by a counter assertion. It will be our task to affirm its entire conformity to a settled plan when we subsequently treat of this Gospel. A hint at its fundamental idea must suffice at present. Throughout the whole composition, the Evangelist is carrying out the theme : The light shined in darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not ; or, as it is stated with greater detail, He came unto His own, and His own received Him not ; but to as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God (chap. i. 5-11). This was the fundamental thought upon which this Evangelist composed and arranged his Gospel from the material of his own reminiscences. This is the reason why he speaks so little of Christ's Galilean ministry, and so much of His contests with the Jewish mind in Jerusalem ; and why, as Weisse incorrectly puts it, 'this Gospel makes almost all the occurrences it relates take place at Jerusalem.'

Weisse sees also, in the connection of the didactic parts, marks of a compiler's hand, and indeed of one who has also but little independence of mind. 'On actual investigation,' says he, 'the forced and laboured occasions for certain sayings and longer discourses, the frequently halting, and never really successful manner of the dialogue, the utter incomprehensibleness of many sayings and apophthegms, in the connection in which they are communicated, cannot but strike us.' The critic then brings forward proofs, viz., examples in which the said incongruities between questions and answers are said to appear. One is met with, he says, in chap. ii. 4, where Jesus gives the well-known answer to His mother's observation, 'they have no wine.' That this answer is difficult to explain, cannot be denied. But this is owing to another property than incongruity ; for as far as this is concerned, it is evident that the answer strictly refers to Mary's remark. Weisse finds a second incongruity in chap. iii. 5. His discovery concerning this passage is in the highest degree striking. When Nicodemus asked, 'How can a man be born when he is old ? Can he enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born ?' and Jesus answered, 'He must be born of water and of the Spirit ;' we have surely a correction of the

most direct kind. It will not, we feel, be necessary to go through the critic's whole catalogue in this manner.

The narrative parts of this Gospel, which, according to Weisse, must be set down to a 'compiler,' are next said to exhibit an utter absence of any general view. 'An error of judgment in our Evangelist of the kind referred to, both with respect to the relation of Jesus to the Jewish people, and His manner of discoursing and method of teaching, in the presence of His disciples and opponents, testifies more plainly against him who thus errs, than all his details in particulars testify for him.' Concerning this supposed error of judgment in the Evangelist, the critic might be sufficiently corrected by the cross as it appears in the statement of the synoptists, but especially by the plan of John himself, which has indeed escaped his research. The graphic nature of the narratives has often been extolled as a proof of the authenticity of this Gospel. Weisse, however, finds, in the very details which render them so, marks which make them doubtful; and, by way of example, tests the cure at Bethesda by this assertion. It is said to testify against the possibility of the narrator being an eye-witness, 'that, according to this narrative, we involuntarily receive the impression that Jesus was going about alone and unaccompanied when He met with the sick man, which seems (ver. 13) to be further confirmed by the fact, that the latter lost sight of Jesus in the crowd, as a solitary and inconspicuous individual.' Certainly the impression obtained by the critic may testify against the fact of John's being an eye-witness of this miracle, but not in the least against his faithful preservation of an occurrence, which Jesus might possibly have related to him a quarter of an hour after its occurrence. The critic is, however, unable to furnish the slightest reason for his view; for Jesus might just as easily have withdrawn Himself from the observation of the sick man, by passing through the multitude with one or more of His disciples, as alone. The circumstance that Jesus began to question the sick man, unapplied to, is next said to excite attention, since, according to the synoptists, such was by no means His custom. But would one who was compiling a narrative so lightly have ventured to depict so original a feature? Did the peculiar character of the patient offer no reason for peculiarity of treatment? This man, who for so long a period had suffered others to come before him,

who seems to have taken no special pains to find people to plunge him at the right moment into the water, who so soon after the benefit he received, lost sight of his benefactor, seems not to have possessed the energy with which many others entreated the Lord. He was not entirely helpless, for he had often attempted to profit by the troubling of the water, and to get into the pool by his own strength; but 'while I am coming,' says he, 'another steppeth in before me.' And yet no wish, no entreaty, no expectation, is heard to proceed from his mouth. If any one suspects this man, he cannot blame Dr Paulus. That he was no impostor, is shown by the readiness of the Saviour to perform this cure; he seems, however, to have been phlegmatic and irresolute in the highest degree. It was for this reason that Jesus so significantly inquired of him, 'Wilt thou be made whole?' and excited within him the desire which was so devoid of vigour. The critic also finds the injunction of Christ: 'Arise, take up thy bed and walk,' utterly inadequate, because the patient had already some strength, and could therefore in case of need stand up and walk. It would be but an insult to my readers to waste a word on this 'utter inadequacy.' The Jews understood the difference between his former and present walking far better. Hence they employed their casuistry in representing it as a sin, that so robust a man should be carrying his bed, an act which they had formerly allowed to the cripple as a work of necessity. The critic, however, here discovers a new difficulty. 'But if it was not allowed to carry a bed on the Sabbath, how could the sick man have had his brought to the pool on that day?' These are the kind of incidents which excite the suspicions of Weisse, in a narrative which he selects as a specimen.

The free mention of the names of persons, towns, and districts by the Evangelist, forms another class of details. 'A considerable part of these indications is so constructed, as to leave an involuntary impression that the narrator inserted them, that he might spare his readers the same trouble it had cost him to make inquiries concerning scenes and persons.' Among such indications are reckoned that 'Bethsaida is called the city of Andrew and Peter;' that when Cana is named a second time, the miracle formerly wrought there is recalled; that when Nicodemus again appears on the scene, he is designated as the same who came to Jesus by night; and others of a like character.

This particularity of statement is, however, far more simply explained, by attributing it to the peculiarity of the author, than to the excessive laboriousness with which he prosecuted his studies of Gospel history, and with which he consequently imparted it to others. Could such information be so very difficult to obtain, in the later apostolic period of the Christian Church? Our critic is leading us imperceptibly beyond the sphere of the Church. Even in such a case, if the inquirer had appropriated the materials of others, it does not follow that he would impart it in the laboured manner supposed. But it well accords with the known character of John, that he should mention with the emphasis of affection such places, for instance, as ‘Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha,’—‘Lazarus whom He raised from the dead,’ and such like.

It is upon such arguments that Weisse founds his assertion, that the fourth Gospel, viewed as an historical authority, stands considerably lower than the synoptical Gospels, and must, in its general view of the character and person of Christ, and of the process of His history, be corrected by them. Though the critic does not commit himself to a distinction of the component parts of the Gospel according to their originality, yet he allows that ‘if anything in the whole composition is the work of John, the so-called prologue is undoubtedly so’ (p. 134). If this prologue is regarded as an organic fragment which needs completion by a corresponding organism, its nature is sufficiently manifested to enable us to postulate the completion furnished by the Gospel itself. The remark that such introductions to historical books are nowhere else found in the New Testament, cannot be brought forward as an argument against the unity of the fourth Gospel. The prologue harmonizes, both in style and view, with the whole work. Nevertheless, it is said to be an independent fragment. How far more does the prologue to the third Gospel differ therefrom! and yet it is universally admitted as a component part. It does certainly need patience to follow the endless caprices, the tricks and turns of modern critical argumentation, for even a short distance.

The Tübingen school has declared, by the votes of a whole series of authors, against the genuineness of the fourth Gospel. The train of argument by which Schwegler, in his work, *Der Montanismus und die christliche Kirche des zweiten Jahrhunderts*,

p. 183, opposes the authenticity of this Gospel, may be regarded as an expression of sympathy with this criticism. The first argument proceeds upon the assertion, that John's doctrine of the Trinity, as far as its degree of formal completeness and definiteness is concerned, anticipates the dogmatic developments of nearly two centuries. This remark is not peculiarly well adapted for placing the argument on a firm foundation. Certainly John's doctrine of the Trinity surpasses, both in purity and fulness, even that of Sabellius and Origen; nay, it may be with truth affirmed, that it has not even yet been exhausted, in its entire ideality, by the utterances either of Christian dogmatism or of religious philosophy. It follows, that if the fact of its surpassing posterity is taken as a starting point for such an argument, we shall find ourselves on the high road to prove that this Gospel is not written yet. The critic, indeed, himself reminds us that 'divining spirits often pass over a long series of intermediate results.' But 'he is surprised, that not only are the other books of the New Testament devoid of John's doctrines of the Logos and the Paraclete, in this form, but especially, that Justin seems to have no notion of any apostolic predecessor in this doctrine.' As far as the other books of the New Testament are concerned, the Christology of Ephes. i. 3, etc., and Col. i. 15, etc., is essentially the same as that announced in the fourth Gospel. Originality of view and expression, however, is an essential feature in our notion of an apostle. It would have been preposterous, if Paul had used the same expressions as John, either in this or in any other respect. And if Justin did not make his saying (*Apol. maj.*), καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν, ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσελθῆτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, exactly conform with John's words, chap. iii. 3, such freedom of expression is so entirely in the style of Christian antiquity, that it is quite surprising to find our author regarding this circumstance as 'a most striking proof' that he was unacquainted with this Gospel. The author supposes that 'Justin, as the sole promulgator of this doctrine in his days, would have felt bound to extend to his novelty the shield of apostolic sanction.' In this remark 'the novelty' is a pure assumption, entirely devoid of foundation. If it be for a moment granted, that the doctrine of the Logos was already known to the Church in Justin's days, through this Gospel, the whole remark falls to

the ground. A second argument of this author is founded on the remark, that a decided distinction between the Logos and the Pneuma is wanting in the earlier fathers till Irenæus, and that this distinction or dogmatic evolution does not make its appearance before the era of John's Gospel, and of Montanism. It is hence supposed 'that both originated in one and the same sphere of theological feeling.' But here also the critic overshoots the mark, in a manner which must be very inconvenient. If this confusion of the Logos with the Pneuma lasted till Irenæus, and if its abolition marks the epoch when St John's Gospel and Montanism appeared, both must have been subsequent to Irenæus. With respect to the relation of the fourth Gospel to Montanism, the author brings forward the similarity between the theories of the Montanists and of John concerning the Paraclete, in which respect he refers to Baur, *Trinitätslehre*, p. 164. In this case, such similarities are mentioned as, that both systems represent the Paraclete as the revealer of futurity, that both give prominence to His judicial activity. The author has indeed a feeling of the difference between the fourth Gospel and Montanism with regard to the Paraclete. 'There we find the tranquil mysterious feature of Christian gnosis, here the coarse reality of the formal deed; there Christian consciousness in its peaceful untroubled perfection, here in its wild, enthusiastic current,' etc. (p. 189). Yet he thinks, p. 204, he cannot but bring up the question as a dilemma, whether the Gospel is the postulate and relative factor of Montanism, or *vice versa*; and arrives at the result, that the Gospel seeks to mediate 'between Jewish and heathen Christianity, two contrasts which stand exactly opposed to each other in their most concrete forms and sharpest distinctness, as Montanism and Gnosticism,'—to admit both extremes in their explained form into the Church, and to point out the correct evangelical medium between them. Apart from the fact that the strongest expression of judaized Christianity is contained, not in Montanism, but in Ebionitism, we would ask, how could this Gospel so mediate between the mutilated Christology of the Montanists, which made the Son inferior to the Pneuma, and the Doceticism of the Montanists, that the Catholic doctrine of the Son of God, and of His perpetual presence in the Church, should be the result? How could it be possible to find any correct evangelical medium between the

enslaved and morbid asceticism of the Montanists, and the asceticism of the Gnostics which misconceived the corporeity? Even the author seems to produce only an extremely one-sided medium, one namely which accuses judaized Christianity as savouring of Marcionism (p. 210), and favours heathenized Christianity, by *struggling for* the conclusion, that 'according to the Gospel, it was only a spiritual body in which the risen Saviour appeared to His disciples.' How the author can reconcile the Marcionism which he fancies he finds in the Gospel, with such passages as John v. 39 and viii. 39, it is not easy to perceive. He should have more explicitly stated what he understands by a 'spiritual body,' having shortly before remarked, that the risen Saviour insists upon the 'materiality of His mode of existence more strongly here than in Luke.' This, at all events, establishes the fact, that the fourth Gospel could as little introduce into the Church a judaized Christian as a heathenized Christian 'extreme' which it had 'explained;' and, least of all, that having committed itself to so erroneous an enterprise, it would be able to maintain its canonicity. The Gospels know nothing of finding this kind of happy medium among themselves, which the author is so taken with. The fact is, that Christianity, even in apostolic times, could not but, from the very first, contend against both the christianized Jewish and christianized heathen views of the world, and oppose these delusions. Its mediation consisted in developing and defining its own nature, in opposition to both. With respect to the principal matter, it is not difficult to see that the Paraclete of St John is very different from that of Montanus. The former appears in the world contemporaneously with the glorification of Christ by His death and resurrection (John vii. 39); the latter appears in the Church with the person of Montanus,¹ or with the establish-

¹ Among the reasons for doubting the historical personality of Montanus, Schwegler brings forward especially, the fact that one of the fathers reproaches him with adultery, while another speaks of his emasculation (p. 241). When Isidor Pelus., however, says, 'Ἡ Μοντανοῦ βλασφημία παιδοκτονίαις, μοιχείαις τε καὶ εἰδωλολατρείαις συντίθεται, it is evident that the reproaches cast upon his doctrine, and not upon his life are intended. Otherwise he is accused of even infanticide and idolatry in the literal sense of the words. His doctrine might, indeed, well be designated adulterous, because it caused wives to leave their husbands, through spiritualistic enthusiasm, in order to follow the leadings of the sect. Even παιδοκτονίαι can only be understood in this sense.

ment of his school (Tertullian, *de virginibus velandis*, c. 1).¹ The former comes as the remembrancer; He speaks not of himself; He brings no new revelation, but explains, as its vital principle, the living unity of the Gospel history (John xiv. 26, chap. xvi. 13). The latter does not appear as a remembrancer of the Gospel history, but rather extinguishes the remembrance of the past and present, and makes new communications to mankind.² Finally, the former founds no church or kingdom different from that of the Son; He brings no third revelation to surpass the revelations of the Father and the Son, but completes the one perpetual revelation of the Father by the Son, to the Church (John xvii.). The latter, on the contrary, is interested in making his revelation appear as a new, another, a third one; and they who proclaim it, separate themselves from the Church universal.³ From these essential differences, which manifest plainly enough the contrast between the mature catholic historic life, and the gloomy enthusiasm of separatism, a multitude of minor ones have been developed, as, for instance, the difference between the healthy energy of the spiritual life in John's Gospel, and the morbid, nay, convulsive passivity of the spiritual life of the Montanists. No further detail, however, is needed to destroy the illusion that Montanism is to be regarded as the postulate, and relatively as the factor, of the fourth Gospel.

This author brings forward the well-known question concerning the day on which the Lord celebrated His last Passover, as a prominent difficulty in the way of acknowledging the genuineness of the fourth Gospel (p. 191). According to Irenæus and Polykrates, John and the Asiatic Church were accustomed to keep Easter in the night of the 14th and 15th Nisan, after the Jewish fashion. 'But what,' says the author, 'if the same John, in his Gospel, makes the 14th the day of Christ's death, and the 13th that of His last Passover, thus depriving the date of the Eastern celebration of Easter of its ecclesiastical and historical sanction?' 'This is, then,' says

¹ Per Evangelium (justitia) efferbuit in juventutem. Nunc per paracletum componitur in maturitatem.

² Tertullian, *adv. Marcion* iv. 22; *De virg. vel.* cap. i. 'ad meliora proficetur.'

³ Euseb. *Hist. eccles.* v. cap. 16-19.

Bretschneider, 'an evident contradiction ; and since the attestation of this fact stands upon a firmer basis than that of John's Gospel, this contradiction becomes an evidence of the non-authenticity of the latter.' The author thinks that the Gospel evidently intends to oppose the Judaic-Christian Passover which was customary in Asia Minor. Its origin must therefore, in any case, date from the middle to the end of the second century. On the other hand, it may be asked, how could even Tatian appeal to four recognised Gospels in support of his work on the Gospels, if this Gospel did not appear till his own days, and was then intended to oppose so powerful a tendency as that of the Asiatic Church? Or how could Irenæus reprove the Romish bishop, Victor, for making the time of the celebration of Easter a subject of contention, if he must have found that the fourth Gospel took up Victor's position, and if he highly prized this Gospel, and gave it an equal rank with the other three? How speedily must this polemical Gospel have gained universal respect in the Church, if in the time of Apollinaris, A.D. 170, it had to struggle for it in Lesser Asia, from an antagonistic stand-point, and had in the time of Irenæus, about A.D. 200, and even earlier, obtained general recognition in the Church? We must, moreover, contemplate the periods in which this opposition on the part of the fourth Gospel is said to have arisen. The assumption (p. 196) that even the meaning of the celebration of the Passover itself was quite differently understood by the Eastern and Western Churches, may be demurred to. The Eastern Church was as little Jewish as the Western ; and it is therefore incorrect to say that 'the Oriental Easter had no other meaning and no other justification than that of being a continuation of the Jewish rite, which had no specifically Christian signification.' The legalism of the Oriental celebration referred entirely to the time, not to the meaning of Easter. This must have appeared the same to the Christian Church everywhere, according to the maturity of the Christian spirit (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). It was quite regular that the death of Christ, the body of the dying Redeemer, should be spoken of under the image of the paschal lamb (John xix. 33-37). The Jewish Christians would have been Talmudists, if the intimate relation between this death and its type had escaped them ; and the critic, in fact, most unjustly assumes that such talmudistic unbelief

existed in the churches of Asia Minor. The peculiar difficulties lie in the passages quoted, which refer to the Lord's last celebration of the Passover. Why did some of the disciples think that by the words, 'That thou doest, do quickly,' Judas was bidden by the Lord to buy what was needed for the feast? This could not have been possible unless the commencement of the feast had been already at hand, that is, unless it had been the evening of the fourteenth Nisan. If it had been the thirteenth, there would be no reason for the pressing word: do quickly. Purchases could then have been made till the evening of the following day, since the feast would not begin till the evening of the fourteenth. But if it were on this evening, it might seem to some, on hearing the words, that Judas had too long delayed the purchase of what was necessary for the feast, and that Jesus was urging him to provide for it as speedily as possible. Then, indeed, the words *ὡν χρεῖαν ἔχομεν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν* do not refer to the paschal lamb itself, but to what was wanted besides for the whole feast, which, in this circle, would probably be provided just before its commencement. This view of the passage also answers to the words (chap. xiii. 1), which have been considered the beginning of these difficulties with respect to the time of the last Passover: *Πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐλήλυθεν αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα, ἵνα μεταβῇ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*, etc. We are herè transported to the moment in which, on one hand, the celebration of the Passover, on the other, the hour when Jesus should depart out of this world unto the Father, were at hand. This departing out of the world is the New Testament parallel to the Old Testament departure of the children of Israel from Egypt, and the word seems chosen by the Evangelist with reference to that departure. The night of the real, and of the typical departure, are identical: it is the night on which the fifteenth Nisan begins. The departure, the redemption, and the deliverance or salvation from death by the atoning blood on which this redemption was founded, are, both in the celebration of the Passover and in the Lord's Supper, the principal matter, the primary, or at least the commemorative idea. Neither the death of the typical lamb, nor the death of the true Paschal Lamb, Christ Jesus, were actually represented, but assumed in the celebrations, as the event on

which they were founded.¹ Thus the killing of the paschal lamb took place on the fourteenth Nisan, not as being the festival itself, but as a preparation for the festival, which was itself held on the evening of the fourteenth Nisan, *i.e.*, at the beginning of the fifteenth Nisan. It was on this day of the month also that the Lord's Supper was instituted; for the death of Jesus was then celebrated in anticipation. If it be asked why, if Christ considered the paschal lamb a type of His death, did He not command His disciples to celebrate the Supper after His death? it may be answered, that this ideality is in conformity with the New Testament. It is just a sealing of that more obscure Old Testament ideality, by which the pious spirit looked, in the celebration of the Passover, to something greater than the preservation in Egypt, and the deliverance from the house of bondage, by which, indeed, it had anticipatively celebrated the death of Christ. Hence Christ also connects His Supper with the Passover, and causes the one to come forth from the other, as the full-blown rose does from the perfected bud. The moment was at hand when Jesus began to wash His disciples' feet: hence John says, 'Before the feast of the Passover.' The washing of their feet was to be, to the disciples, the introduction to that holy night. If it had taken place a whole day before the Passover, they could not have seen in it a distinct reference to that festival. The best support which the reasoning of this author seems to find, is the remark, made by the Evangelist, concerning the Jews who led Jesus before Pilate, that they themselves went not into the judgment-hall, lest they should be defiled, ἀλλ' ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα. If these words are regarded as strictly referring to the eating of the paschal lamb, Christ must certainly have been crucified on the fourteenth Nisan, and have partaken of the last supper with His disciples on the preceding day. But it is questionable whether φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα is to be thus strictly interpreted. Some, especially Lightfoot and

¹ This remark must be carefully taken into account in our doctrinal estimate of the Lord's Supper. The eating of the sacrificed lamb was not the sacrifice itself, but the feasting upon the sacrifice; a solemnity which looks back with gratitude to the sacrifice already offered. This is also the case in the Lord's Supper, it is the enjoyment of the results of the sacrifice. It is according to this fact that the Romish doctrine of the Supper needs to be reformed.

Bynæus, refer these words 'to the so-called Chagiga, or the sacrifice combined with still more cheerful rejoicing, which took place before the close of the first day of the Passover.'¹ Lücke does not, however, consider this view a correct one. Bynæus remarks, that since the defilement incurred by entering the house of a Gentile would only have lasted *one* day, these Jews would not have feared it, if the eating of the paschal lamb were to take place in the evening, that is, on the next day. Lücke, on the contrary, observes that Bynæus only supposes, but does not prove, that entrance into a Gentile house involved only the day's defilement. This may, however, be settled by reference to the passages Acts x. 11, etc., and Lev. xi. 23, etc. It is certain that it had become a custom among the Jews to extend the law concerning defilement by dead unclean animals, to defilement by Gentile habitations. Bynæus and Lightfoot, however, if they extended the expression *φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα* beyond its first and strictest meaning, need not have limited it to the sacrificial meal of the first day. The author of the essay *Zu dem Streite über das letzte Mahl des Herrn* (*Evang. Kirchenzeitung*, 1838, No. 98) rightly remarks: 'The expression, to eat the Passover, designates the consumption of the paschal food in the whole extent of its meaning. This consisted of a lamb, with bitter herbs and unleavened bread, on the first day of the Passover; and for the remaining days, first of unleavened bread, and secondly of peace-offerings.' It may, however, certainly be assumed that the words *φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα* must gradually have obtained the same significance in Jewish ears as, to celebrate the Passover. Christians celebrate the *Supper* and Christmas (*Weihnacht*) in the middle of the day; the Romanist says, I am fasting, when he eats fish on Friday. Fasting is the definite notion; the eating of fish is incidental. And thus, in the Jewish Passover, the eating of the lamb was the root from which the whole feast arose, and so far the whole festival might be included in this expression. We are not then obliged to understand here one definite meal, the desire to partake of which caused the Jews to hesitate at entering the Prætorium. They desired to keep themselves ceremonially clean during the feast; and it was a special part of their observance of the Passover, to avoid the Gentile hall of

¹ Compare Lücke, *Commentar über das Evangelium des Johannes*, 2d Edit., p. 620.

judgment during the middle of the fifteenth Nisan, the feast having already commenced. In further proof of a discrepancy between St John and the synoptists, concerning the time of the Passover, it is also said, that the former twice says of the day of Christ's death, that it was *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα* (chap. xix. 14, 31) (p. 200). The statement of the author is here inaccurate. In chap. xix. 14, we find *ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα*; while in ver. 31, on the contrary, we have *ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν*; and this latter word is referred to the preceding: *ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ τὰ σώματα ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ*. Thus it is evident that preparation, *παρασκευὴ*, is here a stereotyped expression, to denote the day before the Sabbath, the Friday; and that the preparation of the Passover, in this connection, cannot denote the time of preparation for the Passover, but only the Friday occurring during the time of its celebration. Finally, the question, why this Evangelist does not relate the institution of the Lord's Supper, must be answered by a glance at the construction of this Gospel. In any case, it can as little be adduced as a proof of non-authenticity, as, *e.g.*, the circumstance that the institution of baptism is not related. We might even ask the critic, how it happened that the whole ancient Church did not perceive the antagonism of this Gospel to the statements of the three first Gospels, with respect to the time of Christ's last celebration of the Passover, or that, if they did, they accepted the latter without difficulty? Polemic subtilties which were unobserved by the Church, which were never brought forward against the Quartodecimians, could never have been the actual motive of this Gospel. On this assumption, either the Evangelist ill understood polemics, or the Church ill understood polemic expressions.

Another mark of non-authenticity has been found by this critic in the relation of the fourth Gospel to the Apocalypse. 'The Apostle John,' says he, 'is the undeniable author of the Apocalypse. History bears the strongest and most emphatic testimony to this fact.' But since it is merely assumed, and not proved, that the Apocalypse is heterogeneous to the Gospel of John, it will be unnecessary to bring forward what has been elsewhere said against this assumption.¹ This might, indeed, be

¹ *E.g.*, in my *Vermischten Schriften*, vol. ii. p. 173, etc. In the theological annual edited by Dr Zeller (No. iv. p. 657), my view of the Apocalypse is dismissed as an allegorical interpretation. It seems that the critic is not

a good opportunity of keeping 'criticism' to its word with respect to its concession regarding the Apocalypse. Such an attempt, however, would be but labour lost. So long as the conclusions it arrives at vary almost from man to man, and from five years to five years; so long as it turns every defective and contorted view into an argument, it would feel much astonished at being kept to its conclusions.

If we would, however, be convinced that criticism is rushing onwards on a suicidal course, we must contemplate the ever varying and ever transient results to which it 'advances,' till we at length stand with it upon the dizzy height, whence it plunges into the abyss of shame. It brings the Gospels, as far as their origin is concerned, within reach of the apocryphal region, driving them from the centre to the limits of Christendom, till it finally places them in a position in which, like offended spirits, they turn and sit in judgment upon their insolent and perplexed judge.

According to Weisse, the Gospel of John was the work of some unknown compiler, who made use of certain records, still extant, from the hand of the Apostle John, and consisting of isolated reflections relating to the life of Jesus. These reflections are themselves, however, 'the laboured product of the disciple's mind, in its endeavour to seize that image of his Master which was threatening to dissolve into a misty form, to re-collect its already vanishing features, and to cast them in a new mould, by the help of a self-formed or borrowed theory concerning that Master's nature and destination : ' p. 110. The Gospel itself is said not to have been composed till a later period, and by a compiler living at a time remote from the matters it treats of.

According to Schwegler, the Gospel of St John belongs to a series of reformatory writings which, appearing about the middle of the second century, mark the commencement of a reaction against Judaism. But it was the manner of such attempts, especially when they were united with peaceful aims, to arrogate *that apostolic authority which was on their adversaries' side* in favour of their own tendency, and by cutting away the ground under the feet of the opposing party, to preserve the common apostolic point of union (p. 214). Here, then, this yet clear upon the difference existing between an allegorical interpretation, and an interpretation of the allegorical.

Gospel is, in fact, but a spurious work, imputed to the Apostle John, the patchwork of an impostor opposing apostolic relations.

According to Bauer, the Gospels are poetic productions of the Evangelists, founded on the Christian consciousness of the Church. In this inventive agency, Mark has retained the largest amount of genuineness, Luke has surpassed Mark, and Matthew, Luke. 'The fourth' leaves all the rest behind him. 'When a scarecrow is pulled to pieces, and the purpose for which it was set up is perceived, there is nothing more of it left,' says he, in a pause during the process of 'pulling to pieces' 'the history of the resurrection of Lazarus' (*Krit.* vol. iii. 185). So unsuccessful, in his opinion, is the work of the fourth Evangelist. He thus also characterizes him: 'The unnamed writer is an airy vision, an airy vision first formed by the fourth himself; and, in this instance, the fourth has for once made a lucky hit, by giving his composition such an author. At first he sought to make it appear that there was another Gospel, derived from an eye-witness, and in fact written by one. An airy vision, however, would be the only fitting author of such a writing as the fourth has handed down to us.'¹ Lützelberger² exports the Gospel which has been called the heart of Christ still further. According to him, the fourth Gospel (see Weisse) is all of a piece, in contrast to the synoptists, who exhibit a lyric, unequal appearance, and in whose writings differing tones and strange discrepancies appear. This Gospel is said to have originated in Edessa, or its neighbourhood, a distant part of Asia. 'The author of this Gospel,' argues the critic, 'could not possibly have been acquainted with the form of the Gospel history, as handed down by the three other Gospels.' But this is accounted for, when it is known 'that it originated on the other side of the Euphrates, and therefore beyond the limits of the Roman power,¹ where the influence of the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome was not so considerable.' Thus this Gospel is said to have arisen as far as possible beyond that sphere of

¹ Vol. iii. p. 340.

² Lützelberger: *Die Tradition über den Apostel Johannes und seine Schriften in ihrer Grundlosigkeit nachgewiesen von Lützelberger*, Leipzig, 1840.

³ According to Lützelberger, Matthew's Gospel originated in Egypt, Luke's in Antioch, Mark's in Rome.

existence which was more peculiarly that of the Church! The pretended polemical views of the Gospel are also said to support the assumption of the author. He finds much that is warped in the external polemical tendencies of this Gospel, because its inner nature, its idea, and the vital unity with which this is carried out, are hidden from him. First of all, for instance, the Gospel is said polemically to oppose John's disciples. 'It is shown with all possible care, that John the Baptist absolutely declared, that not himself but Jesus was the Christ.' 'It must, however, be remembered, that the Sabæans, or disciples of John, were spread over Galilee, Syria, and the farther parts of the Parthian region, since they still exist in Persia.' The Gospel is further said to oppose the Docetæ (p. 276). Now Syria and Mesopotamia were well known as the special seats of Docetism. The author therefore ought, in fairness, to have shown how it happened that, in a church which was originally thoroughly Docetic, a Gospel should have originated, spread, and been accepted, which entirely opposed this tendency. The author, however, is so little acquainted with the specific nature of Docetism as a necessary result of that dualistic principle, which opposes to the good principle, the evil principle existing in matter, that he further on makes the author of the Gospel himself a Docetic. The earthly, the coarse material, is in this Gospel that which is opposed to the divine, which is subdued and subjected to the power of evil, to the prince of the world (p. 284). 'The doctrine of the Logos, or the doctrine of the good Lord of heaven, necessarily introduced the opposite doctrine of the evil Lord of the world:' p. 286. And this Evangelist, who is thus himself a Docetist, is said to have opposed Docetism. This is the position whence 'criticism' plunges into the abyss!

The pious Hans Sachs, after long misconception and abuse, found an 'apologist' in Göthe, when he said,

' In Froschpfuhl all das Volk verbannt,
Das seinen Meister je verkannt.'

The misconception and ill-treatment which 'the fourth' has so often experienced in our days, will perhaps soon call forth a general disposition in theology and science to apply this sentence of Göthe to those critics who have misconceived St John. At any rate these critics have to deal with a very different John from the venerable Master Hans of Nuremberg.

NOTES.

1. In the work, *Das Evangelium Johannes nach seinem innern Werthe und seiner Bedeutung für das Leben Jesu Kritisch untersucht von Dr Alex. Schweizer*, the genuineness of this Gospel is, on the whole, maintained; at the same time, however, the hypothesis that this Gospel is interspersed with interpolations, which are the work of a later hand, and designed to contribute a somewhat Galilean addition, is carried out with much ingenuity. Considerable difficulties are, however, opposed to this hypothesis, even when but generally considered. It might fairly be asked, How could this Gospel have been so abundantly interpolated without this circumstance having been, at any time, or in any manner, noticed in the Church? If it had been interpolated before its propagation in the Church, John was mistaken in those to whose care he committed his work. If it were interpolated subsequently, it might be expected that manuscripts must be found which would support the original against the subsequent form of this Gospel; as, on the other hand, it is generally in this manner that subsequent additions are discovered. It may be further asked, Why should the original form be devoid of a Galilean element? The Evangelist might indeed have had a plan which led him more especially to depict the ministry of Jesus in Judea, but could hardly have formed one which would induce him to exclude events which took place in Galilee. Was the interpolater already acquainted with the offence which modern criticism would take at the lack of the Galilean element in John, and desirous to obviate it beforehand? Could he misconceive the completeness of this Gospel? We would point to this completeness as a fact which decides the question. If it is once recognised, no place is found for admitting interpolations. The author starts with the 'appended twenty-first chapter.' He finds in the passage, chap. xx. 30, the formal conclusion, and considers the twenty-first chapter to be appended in a manner unprecedented in the Gospels. Now it cannot be denied, that the passage in question does form a conclusion to that exhibition of the manifestations of Christ's glory, which were designed to call forth faith in Him. But it may be asked, whether the fundamental idea which guided the Evangelist in the composition of this Gospel, might not admit an epilogue, as a

counterpoise to the prologue which introduced it. The prologue sets forth the eternal life of Christ, preceding His appearance in the world; the epilogue seems intended to represent His spiritual government in the world, as it was to continue after His return to the Father. To the prehistoric life of Christ, John the Baptist is the chosen witness. In conformity with his custom of representing the general by significant particulars, the Evangelist names him only, though many more testified to the coming of Christ. To His post-historic life the disciples Peter and John testify, as two strongly contrasted representatives of all the conflicts and triumphs of the kingdom of God. In the life of Peter, Christ specially manifests Himself as the ever present Lord of His Church; in the life of John, as the Lord of glory who will shortly return from heaven. Such an epilogue completes the circle, in which the end of this Gospel significantly and definitely unites with its beginning, the prologue. The author then proceeds upon the assumption that the verses 24, 25 of chap. xxi. are an addition by a later hand,—an assumption which we will admit without discussion. This concluding remark, however, is next said to show that the appended narratives are from the same later hand. ‘He is conscious of having appended a narrative, and therefore assures us that it would be possible to make an infinity of insertions.’ We may, however, rest assured, that any one who felt it possible to narrate so much, would not have contented himself with the addition of *one* narrative to the Gospel, when he had, moreover, once made a beginning; while, on the other hand, he would hardly have selected from his materials a narrative so emphatically a concluding one. Secondly, it is said that John could not himself have corrected the report circulated among the disciples in the manner indicated. Why not? All that is done is to set aside a false and superficial interpretation of a deeply significant saying of Christ, and this can by no means appear ‘word-splitting,’ even though it does not at the same time give the correct meaning. Thirdly, the narratives are said to be of a legendary kind, and not related in the style of the Apostle John. But let, *e.g.*, chap. xxi. 7 be compared with chap. xx. 4, and how minutely are they in accordance! Such a transaction as here takes place between Christ and Peter, could not possibly have arisen in the realm of the legendary, nor was there any of the disciples who

would have so entirely understood and preserved its whole depth, power, and tenderness, as John. With respect to the style of this paragraph, Credner, after enumerating the expressions which are not in the style of this apostle, in the paragraph chap. vii. 23–viii. 11, says, ‘ Chap. xxi. presents appearances of an entirely different kind. There is not one single external testimony against it; and regarded from an internal point of view, this chapter exhibits almost every peculiarity of John’s style.’ The passage chap. xix. 35–37 is further regarded as an interpolation. Here the Perfect *μεμαρτύρηκε* is thought striking. But the Evangelist might well thus express himself with reference to the fact, that as an Evangelist he had, throughout the course of a long life, laid great stress upon this striking circumstance; and he designates his *μαρτυρία* as *ἀληθινή*, because as believing testimony, it had been united to and penetrated by its object. It was because his *μαρτυρία* had this veracity that ‘ he knoweth that he saith true ’ (*ὅτι ἀληθὴ λέγει*). The constant vigour and accuracy of his memory is derived from his living in the truth. Nor can the choice of the adjective *ἀληθινός* be regarded as a mark of want of genuineness. The addition *ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς πιστεύσητε* is certainly striking, and can only be explained by the fact, that John attributed great importance to the circumstance that the legs of the crucified Jesus were not broken (ver. 33). That this circumstance should strike him as a wonderfully minute coincidence between the treatment of the typical, and the history of the true Paschal Lamb, and should be a powerful confirmation of his faith, is entirely consistent with the ‘ ideal ’ John; and this ‘ external matter ’ could scarcely seem to him anything else but a real manifestation of so specially ideal an incident. The importance attached by this Evangelist to the recognition that Christ was the true antitype of the paschal lamb (chap. i. 29, 36, vi. 53, etc., xiii.), appears from several passages of this Gospel. Hence it must have been significant in his eyes, that even this solitary fact, that the legs of the crucified Saviour were not broken, should designate Him as the Paschal Lamb. Why should not this sense for the significant have been specially characteristic of John, whose custom it ever is to seize the general in the particular, in the decidedly concrete, or whenever a clearly purposed symbolism offers the opportunity? The paschal lamb was the sacrificial repast of travellers, of fugitives; it referred to non-ritual sacrifice. This

circumstance was specially expressed by the fact that it was roasted whole, that a bone of it was not broken (Ex. xii. 46). This symbolical trait was repeated in the case of the corpse of Jesus. It also was not treated according to law by the civil authorities, and still less sacrificed according to the Levitical ritual; but was a sacrifice which, during the most violent storm of the world's history, was offered 'without the camp,' in strict historical reality, for the redemption of His people. This agreement between the type and the reality is so speaking, that another than John would scarcely have remarked upon it.—Among lesser interpolations this author further includes chap. xviii. 9. The words *ἵνα πληρωθῇ* seem to him to be not happily applied to the passage John xvii. 12, because here a bodily, there a spiritual, preservation is spoken of. 'This intermixture or confusion of bodily with spiritual destruction, is in glaring opposition to the thoughtful and ideal tone of this Gospel.' But what if, in their bodily preservation at this time, the Evangelist saw the pledge of their spiritual preservation, as was in fact the case? (comp. John xii. 36; Luke xxii. 31, 32). Offence is further taken at the remark of the disciples (xvi. 30), that Jesus knew all things, because it relates to the fact that He anticipated their objections and questions. The apostle, however, is here pointing out an important moment, namely, that in which the light first burst upon the disciples, that Jesus must leave them. It dawned upon them, however, by means of the disclosure in ver. 28; and in the fact that Jesus had given them certainty by this disclosure, they recognised the omniscience of His insight of the uncertainty of their minds, and of the depths of truth.—Chap. ii. 21, 22 is also said to testify to 'the same alien spirit.' The author first considers the interpretation of the words (ver. 19) *λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτου*, etc., which John gives in ver. 21 as his own ('But He spake of the temple of His body'), as incorrect. He asks, Could John have so expounded them, and moreover have called this the exposition of the disciples, when the correct meaning—viz., 'the destruction of the Jewish form of the theocracy, and the establishment of a purer one'—appears in Acts vi. 14, etc.? The difficulty which exegetes have for some time found in this passage disappears at once, when it is considered that, from the evangelical point of view, the destruction of the Old Testament theocracy and the destruction of Christ's body

must appear identical. It was only by the death of Christ that the Old Testament form of the theocracy was legally dissolved (Rom. vii. 4). The Jews could not put Christ to death, without at the same time spiritually casting a brand into their temple. From that time forth it was doomed to destruction, and the Old Covenant abolished. It could not have been legally abolished in any other manner than by condemning Christ by a hierarchically legitimate proceeding. John therefore perceived here also, the deep relation between type and antitype.—The critic then proceeds to the examination of the longer passages which he regards as interpolated; among which he reckons the miracle at Cana (ii. 1–12), the healing at Capernaum (iv. 44–54), the miracle of the loaves and fishes (vi. 1–26)—*i.e.*, the history both of the miracle itself, and of the return across the lake.

First, the miracle of Cana is said to stand in opposition to what is said, chap. i. 52, of the greater works of Christ which were to follow the *σημεῖον*, ver. 51. This miracle, however, can hardly oppose the expectation of those greater works of Christ, which had been previously excited. The first argument rests upon a view of the meaning of miracles, according to which a distinction is made in an abstract manner between these and the agency of Christ upon the spiritual life. It is further adduced, as a fact unexampled in the writings of John, that the whole occurrence contains neither a discourse, nor conversation of Jesus. This remark is however opposed, *e.g.*, by chap. v. 5–9. This miracle is also designated as one utterly magical, and, ‘in a moral sense, scarcely conceivable.’ This miracle is certainly one of the most difficult, but it only follows that it makes large demands upon the patience and confidence of the penetrating and exegetical mind. Finally, it is said, that the belief here exhibited by Mary, is inconsistent with the unbelief subsequently ascribed to ‘His brethren’ (and Mary). And Mary? Even His brethren (chap. vii.) were only unbelieving in that higher sense, in which the impatience and self-will of a superstitious belief appears to the evangelical mind as unbelief. The other remarks are easily dismissed. It can surely offer no difficulty that Jesus had been invited with His disciples, although it is not known how this was done, for an invitation might be given in a hundred different ways. But that His disciples are said to have ‘believed in Him’ after the miracle, although they believed in

Him before, is an emphasis entirely consistent with this apostle's mode of expression. Among the examples cited to show that the expression *ἡ ὥρα μου*, in John, always means the hour of Christ's death, and is therefore inaptly used in this place, chap. xii. 27 might well have an opposite effect, and yet the hour is here more generally designated *ὥρα αὐτῆς*. What then is the meaning of this expression, but that Jesus is speaking of *His* hour, in direct opposition to the false and erroneous notions of others? Is the expression *ὁ καιρὸς μου* quite adapted to express this contrast, when it relates to moments? When, indeed, it does not relate to them, time is opposed to time (*ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμέτερος*, John vii. 6). So also the expression *αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα* (chap. xiii. 1) forms a contrast to the hour of the typical Passover, which was contemporaneous with that of His departure. His hour is everywhere that fixed upon for the temporal development of His life, in the counsel of God, in opposition to the calculations, wishes, and opinions of men. It is with such a reference to the divine appointment that it is said, Luke xxii. 53: *αὕτη ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ἡ ὥρα*.—In the miracle of healing (iv. 44–54), a difficulty is first found in the circumstance, that it is said, ver. 43, that Jesus went into Galilee, and that His motive for so doing is explained ver. 44 by the words: *Αὐτὸς γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν, ὅτι προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει*. It must, however, first of all be remarked, that the interpolater would be inconsistent not with the Evangelist, but with himself, if any general contradiction were found in the declarations of vers. 44 and 45. Hence the apparent contradiction in question can by no means be regarded as a sign of interpolation, unless the passage begins with ver. 45; but then the contradiction occurs in the passage which belongs to John, ver. 44 being connected with ver. 43. Consequently the explanation of this difficulty might be passed by; for, at all events, it advances nothing in favour of an interpolation. The connection of the passage may, however, be easily maintained, by attributing an inaccuracy of expression to the Evangelist. Jesus departs from Samaria as a traveller to Galilee in general. He does not take up His abode in Nazareth, His *πατρίς* strictly speaking, and that from the motive stated in ver. 44. At all events, *πατρίς* must be limited to His native town. For the sphere of a prophet's continual disparagement cannot be His native country, but only His native town. If

then we are obliged to concede an inaccuracy of expression, it is more easily explained by the style of John, who everywhere deals in parentheses, than by supposing an interpolater beginning his matter with a contradiction (vers. 44 and 45). The passages, ver. 46, in which Cana is again designated as the place where Jesus made the water wine, and ver. 54, where this striking miracle is said to be the second that Jesus did when He was come out of Judea into Galilee, are also said to be doubtful. These traits are, however, among those which Weisse regards as peculiarities of style in the fourth Gospel. According to Weisse, therefore, these very traits are decisive for the genuineness of the passage. So inconsistent are the humours of critics! Ver. 48 is said to be still more difficult. 'How could this man, who travelled with so much confidence towards Jesus, in the expectation of a miracle, such as had not yet been seen in Galilee, have deserved from Jesus such a rebuke in answer to his believing request?' He was indeed one of those many inhabitants of Capernaum who would never have concerned himself about Jesus, who had taken up His abode among them, unless a domestic calamity had arisen; and the rebuke is expressed as mildly as possible. The man is actually corrected in a three-fold manner by Jesus: first in his request that He would hasten back with him; then in his second, that He would heal his son in His usual way; thirdly, in his assertion that his son was at the point of death. The first need of the painfully excited father was tranquillity of mind, and a faith reposing on the quiet means of unexpected help. Jesus gives him this faith; hence the use of the word *τέρατα* in His reproof. It is not till he acquiesces in the form of help which Jesus points out, that he proves himself possessed of true faith. Finally, this narrative is said to be a parallel to that of the centurion in the synoptic Gospels (Matt. viii. 5), but far more indistinctly related. Too much stress is, however, laid upon the external resemblances of the two narratives; and the decided contrast they exhibit is lost sight of, when they are looked upon as identical. The centurion of the earlier Gospels merely states his distress: he is too humble to solicit Jesus to make a long journey for his sake, and too believing to think this necessary. He is almost shocked when Jesus makes him the offer of coming to heal his sick servant. In what an opposite spirit does the nobleman of St John's Gospel approach

Jesus; and hence how different is the treatment he meets with! The internal character of both histories is decisive with respect to the question of their diversity. It is as little possible to confound this βασιλικὸς with the ἐκατόνταρχος, as to take two men whom we might meet at different places one after another, and whose countenances were entirely different, for the same persons, because they both perhaps wore a red collar to their coats. For the rest, this miracle is not described merely as the second Galilean one, but as the second which Jesus wrought in returning from Judea to Galilee.

Lastly, with respect to the feeding of the multitude (vi. 1-26), it is said, first, that the miracle itself is abruptly introduced, in marked disharmony with what precedes, and in internal disconnection with what follows. It is certainly striking that the Evangelist should so suddenly change the scene. 'Jesus was teaching in the temple at Jerusalem, ver. 47. Suddenly, and without mention of any return to Galilee, chap. vi. 1, after an indefinite μετὰ ταῦτα, continues with ἀπῆλθεν πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας, etc.' The author's opinion is, that the passage chap. vi. 1-26 is interpolated in the discourse which Jesus, according to chap. v., delivered in the temple, and that the discourse chap. vi., from ver. 27 to the close of the chapter, is connected with the former, and was consequently spoken in Jerusalem. If, however, we view the Gospel under this assumption, and omit the supposed interpolation, we shall find the change of scene quite as sudden as before. At the close of the fifth chapter, we find Jesus still in the temple at Jerusalem; at the beginning of the seventh, we are informed that 'after these things Jesus walked in Galilee;' and then, immediately thereafter, He goes again to Jerusalem; and we hear nothing of His ministry in Galilee. Thus the choice offered us is, whether we accept, according to the existing text, the sudden change of scene, with a sojourn in Galilee filled up with occurrences; or, according to the hypothesis, an equally sudden change of scene, with a sojourn utterly barren of events. We pass over the isolated expressions which are said to recall the synoptists; the indefinite τὸ ὅρος finds, indeed, the contrast which defines it, in the shores of the lake. The narrative is next said to be contradictory of what follows it. 'How strange is it, that the men who had been so miraculously fed, and so struck by this deed

of Jesus, that they (ver. 15) desired to take Him by force and make him a Messianic king, should, on the very next day, encounter Him with "What sign (*σημεῖον*) showest Thou then, that we may see and believe Thee?" And how still more incomprehensible is it, that they should (ver. 31) just hit upon the thought, that a miracle similar to the manna would suffice them! We can point, however, to something equally 'strange' in the eighth chapter, where it is said, ver. 30, that 'many believed on Him,' and in ver. 37, that Jesus said, 'ye seek to kill Me.' Is not this contradiction greater? Here, however, it is to be referred to no 'interpolater;' but the return of such characteristic 'singularities' rather points to a peculiarity of view in this Evangelist, and consequently testifies to the genuineness of the present passage. That these people are so 'strange,' is the very fact which the writer desires to represent. Jesus Himself reproaches them with it in the words, 'Ye seek Me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled.' The author finds this saying striking; but it evidently arises from the thought, that the miraculous meal has two sides: as a miracle, it attracts the higher sense, by means of its spiritual element; as a meal, however, it attracts the common sense, by means of its utility. To these utilitarians, the miracle of Jesus must have appeared less than that of Moses, not merely because Jesus had made use in the miracle of a natural substratum, but because Moses had, so to speak, continuously provided for his people by the manna, and because Jesus had given them to understand that they must not seek the realization of such utilitarian ideals from Him. These people, as such, are just the *Ἰουδαῖοι* of John, and not Israelites within the limits of Judea, or 'the upper class and their dependants at Jerusalem, the mention of whom is said to betray that this discourse was originally delivered at Jerusalem.' That Jesus, then, should oppose to the notions of these men, who, in the chiliastic spirit of a corrupt Judaism, would have made Him a king, the doctrine of the true bread of life, is quite what might be expected, and can by no means be regarded as inconsistent with the miracle itself, as the author supposes (p. 85). According to this supposition, the saying of Jesus, ver. 27, 'Labour not for the bread that perisheth,' must also deny the account of this miracle in the synoptical Gospels.

On the return across the lake, the author remarks, 'The whole narrative, the feeding of the multitude and the return, is, in its manner, style, indefiniteness, and lack of intuitive vision, unlike the genuine writings of John;' hereby assuming that the ordinary style of this apostle is definite and intuitive. It is, however, questionable, whether this can be affirmed of his statement of external relations in their actual connection and chronological sequence. The peculiar excellence of this apostle lies in entirely opposite qualities, and the very clumsiness of the narrative, especially vers. 22-24, might rather be adduced as a sign of the genuineness of the passage. An interpolator would have been careful to manage this crossing over more conveniently. When it is further said, ver. 16, *ὡς δὲ ὄψία ἐγένετο*, and ver. 17, *σκοτία ἤδη ἐγγόνει*, this shows no diversity of style with the expression, *οὔσης ὀψίας*, chap. xx. 19. In both cases, it was intended definitively to state that it was actually night. In the latter case, this would be made more evident by the circumstance *καὶ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων*; but upon the lake such a circumstance was wanting, and it was consequently necessary to use a more definite expression. 'The five and twenty or thirty furlongs' of ver. 19 are entirely opposed to this author's conjecture, that the disciples, according to the meaning of the Evangelist, rowed along the northern shore of the lake, and that Jesus followed them on foot along this shore, and overtook them at a short distance from their destination, after they had been detained by the storm. If the passage across the lake, which amounted to forty furlongs, had been only twenty-five or thirty, it would even then have been impossible that this circuitous route should have amounted only to the same number of furlongs. The *πλοιάρια* of ver. 23 cannot, moreover, be the ships in which the people returned, as is here believed (p. 93). The intention of the Evangelist is very clear, though his expressions are not so. When the people, on the morning after the miracle, were standing on the shore, they well knew that only one vessel had been at the disposal of Jesus and His disciples, also that only the disciples had departed in this vessel, and that Jesus was not with them. They could not, therefore, but conclude that He was still on their side of the lake, and would have sought Him there. But other ships had arrived

from Tiberias, nigh unto the place where they had eaten bread, and Jesus might have used one of these for His return. As, therefore, they did not find Him, it seemed to them increasingly probable that He had used such an opportunity of crossing, and they immediately entered the ships that they might seek Him in Capernaum.

2. A very valuable contribution towards the solution of the inquiry, whether the supper spoken of John xiii. was the last Passover which Jesus celebrated with His disciples, and that connected with it, concerning the day on which Jesus died, has been furnished by Wieseler in his *Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels*. Comp. section 5 of the above-named work: *Von dem letzten königlichen Einzug Jesu in Jerusalem bis zu seinem Tode und seiner Grablegung. Die Leidenswoche*.¹

¹ [Since Wieseler's publication, other valuable contributions have been made to the solution of this important and somewhat involved question. Lichtenstein (*Lebensgeschichte*, Anmerk. 79), Riggenbach, in the ablest chapter of an excellent volume (*Vorlesungen über das Leben Jesu*, pp. 610-660, ed. 1858), and Andrews (*Life of our Lord*, pp. 369-397, ed. 1863), present all the difficulties of the subject along with sufficient material for their satisfactory solution. They agree in the conclusion, that the four Evangelists concur in asserting that the Lord ate the true paschal supper at the time when it was eaten by the Jews in general, on the evening following the 14th Nisan; and that the Friday on which He was crucified was the 15th, and therefore the first Sabbath of the feast. With this general conclusion Fairbairn agrees (*Hermeneutical Manual*, p. 334), though with some interesting differences in the argument, and without so full a treatment of all the points usually discussed. Ellicott, however (*Hist. Lectures*, p. 122), still holds to the opinion of the Greek fathers, that He suffered on the 14th, and consequently ate the paschal supper on the eve with which that day commenced. He does not, however, present his reasoning in much detail.—ED.]

PART VI.

THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

SECTION I.

VARIOUS VIEWS OF THE ORIGIN OF THE FOUR GOSPELS.

A DEFINITE historical tradition concerning the origin of the four Gospels is in existence, and has already been the subject of our discussion. This tradition explains the most essential peculiarities of the four Gospels; viz., that Matthew keeps so closely to the Hebrew national consciousness; that Mark is not so exact about the chronological sequence of his statements; that Luke has so much that is catholic, and consistent with the point of view of Gentile Christianity; and, lastly, that John furnishes us with so few of the circumstances communicated by the other three, because his intention was to supply what they had omitted.

The modern scientific consideration of the Gospels finds this tradition insufficient to explain the remarkable phenomenon exhibited by the relation of the four Gospels to each other, viz., that, on the one hand, they present a unity as complete as if they were but one work; and, on the other, as much diversity as if neither were aware of the existence of the other.

Various explanations have been given, especially in the work of Gieseler: *Historisch kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien* (p. 30, etc.).¹

The first attempt at explaining this phenomenon insists upon regarding one writing as the primitive Gospel, the matter of which is said to be the basis of each separate synoptical Gospel. Some have considered that this primitive basis was formed by the original Gospel of Matthew, others by the so-called Gospel of the Hebrews, and others again by an original

¹ Lately also in the copious work of Ebrard, *Gospel History*, p. 21.

Aramæan Gospel. Eichhorn considers that compilations from this primitive Gospel originated the three first Gospels. Such an origin of the Gospels is, however, so artificial and far-fetched, that it can scarcely be understood how it was possible that the critic could recognise such a monstrosity of compilation in the first models of the free and beautiful originality of the New Testament, the hideous mask of a literary corpse in these firstlings of a specifically new literary life.¹ The Gospels are equally regarded as still-born, compiled productions without originality, when either the Gospel of Matthew, or that of Mark, or that of Luke, is looked upon as the basis on which the others were formed. But this dead fabrication system has been applied not merely to the relation of the second and third Gospels to the supposed first, but also to the relation of the third to the supposed second. According to such suppositions, the second Evangelist made use of the work of the first, and the third of the works of the second and first, in compiling his own. Concerning the order, however, in which this paralytic authorship took place, as many hypotheses have been formed as the transposition of the names Matthew, Mark, and Luke would furnish; *e.g.*, Matthew, Luke, Mark; Mark, Matthew, Luke, etc. This is the permutation system.² To get at the secret by means of permutation, criticism has formed a kaleidoscope of all the existing possibilities, and then shaken this kaleidoscope again and again, thus producing every possible combination in this one lifeless kind of view. Operations of this kind might perhaps compete in rigidity, insipidity, and misconception of the living originality of the said writings, with any of the performances of a talmudic-rabbinical style of treatment. A more striking instance of the tendency to construct the fairest mystery of unity in variety, and variety in unity, the mystery of the most glorious vitality, not merely out of the deepest, but also out of the most pitiable kind of death, has seldom paraded itself in learned pomp before the world.

The view which attributes the separate or remaining Gospels

¹ See Ebrard, p. 21. [See also a very thorough examination of this hypothesis by Andrews Norton, *Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 60, and Note D.—ED.]

² See Ebrard, p. 22; [or Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. iii. ; Davidson's *Introd.*, vol. i. 382 and 387; Reuss, *Geschichte d. h. Schriften*, p. 164.—ED.]

to lesser evangelical writings or essays, representing single incidents in the life of Christ, or to memoirs, may be regarded as the corresponding vital counterpart to that dead assumption of a primitive Gospel which would degrade them into external compilations.¹ Such a view entirely corresponds with the idea of the solemn remembrance in which this life was preserved. But the same difficulties to which the former hypothesis gave rise, are experienced when these memoirs are regarded as primitive records, which the Evangelists regarded and treated as diplomatically certain and authoritative, and not as assisting and completing the living and independent tradition of the Gospel.

Both assumptions agree in the one point of giving a written foundation to the synoptic Gospels, and are opposed to the view which accepts an oral Gospel tradition, as a new and different explanation of the phenomenon in question. Nothing is more certain, than that the Gospel facts must have been preserved in a most powerful tradition. The Christian Church at first found its daily edification, nay, its heaven, in this tradition. But the view of its development assumes in the field of criticism, the character of regarding this tradition as the exclusive basis of the Gospels. It is in the maintenance of this exclusiveness that this view also becomes hypothesis, and betrays its hypothetical character by running into opposite extremes. On the one hand arises the view, that tradition was gradually formed into a verbally fixed, oral Gospel, and that it thus gradually assumed a liturgical character. Here then tradition appears in its highest form, as a crystallization.² On the other hand appears the notion which represents Gospel tradition as the obscure stream of excited, heathenish popular imagination,

¹ To this belongs Schleiermacher's view of the origin of Luke's Gospel, founded on the preface thereto.

² Compare Gieseler, *Historisch-kritisch Versuch*, etc., p. 53, etc. The notion of a stereotyped oral tradition was formed especially by Kaiser. Gieseler's view is a more lively one. [Westcott very ably advocates a 'definite oral Gospel,' which was gradually formed, not by popular tradition, but by apostolic preaching; he does not, however, absolutely exclude the use of written documents, although inclining to do so. Norton (i. p. 284) maintains that 'the oral narratives of the apostles were the common archetype' of the Gospels. Davidson (i. 405 ff.) is of the same opinion, and does not differ from Westcott even in the degree that the latter seems to imagine (p. 189).—ED.]

which, carrying along with it a stratum of Gospel facts, or even of primitive fictions, deposited them as half or wholly 'washed-down legends,' like water-rolled pebbles against the dams of the written Gospels.¹

The latest hypothesis, which regards the Gospels as productions of the Evangelists, whose minds are said to have expressed in naïve fiction the consciousness of the Church, need only be mentioned for the sake of completeness.²

It cannot but be an enigma to subsequent ages, that in an age which prided itself upon highly esteeming what was original in subjective and individual life, it could ever have come to pass, that the origin of the Gospels should be regarded as an enigma—an obscure and difficult enigma. For it is owing to the very circumstance that the vital originality of the separate Gospels has been ignored in the most unworthy manner, that this difficulty has become so great and unsolvable. The actual factor was misconceived, through misconception of the peculiarity of the Evangelists; how, indeed, could it be possible to comprehend the mutual relation of the Gospels, when this was not duly estimated? It is true that the former doctrine of inspiration had laid the foundation of this depreciation of the personal in the Gospels. As the too high demands of a former harmony brought forth the rationalistic tendency, so did the former degradation of the Evangelists produce the whole series of views, which regarded them as mere mechanical transcribers. But her own poverty and helplessness carried criticism even farther than the results of this misconception prescribed. Even the factors granted were not treated in an historical manner, when it was supposed that the hypothesis of a written basis to the Gospels must overthrow the tradition-hypothesis; and, on the other hand, that the latter could not exist in the presence of the former. For want of transposition into the scene, and of submissively accepting the appearance of the gospel-spirit in the Gospels, they have been alternately regarded as the production of one or other of a series of pale spectral forms; and it has been insisted, that they originated in either literary compilation or a liturgical rhapsodical

¹ So Strauss. Weisse has appropriated the expression, washed-down legend, although he shows some repugnance to the washing river, the myth-forming tradition. See his *Evangelische Geschichte*, p. 7, etc.

² See *Kritik der evang. Geschichte*, by Bruno Bauer.

hymn, or the plastic formative presentiment, or finally the fixed idea of a species of poetry, which was said to have no consciousness of its artistic doings. Gospels formed in such a manner, would indeed have been far below that glowing, living, solemn remembrance which animated the apostolic Church and its Evangelists.

NOTE.

Gieseler in his above-named work, p. 35, etc., dismisses the hypothesis which would make one Gospel the basis of the others in the following words: 'Besides the absence of all historical grounds, these hypotheses may also be met in the following manner. (1) It is not evident what motive could have induced the later Evangelist, if he were acquainted with the work of an able predecessor, instead of circulating the same, with the addition of a supplement if he thought it necessary, to have brought it out under his own name, after a very unimportant revision, at least with respect to its contents. (2) In whatever order the Gospels may be arranged, there always remains in the earlier, much which the later have omitted; yet they could not have considered this incorrect, and it would be difficult to prove that just these passages were those that were unsuitable for all classes of readers. (3) How contrary is the work of revision which must be accepted, to the spirit of an age which produced but few authors! Here the later Evangelist gives whole narratives and isolated sentences an entirely different position; he must therefore have turned over his predecessor's work, selecting first from one place, then from another. In one place he begins by transcribing verbally, and then exchanges words and thoughts; at another time he omits thoughts; and finally changes expressions for their synonyms without alteration of thoughts. And yet, with all this affectation, these writings bear so distinct an impress of unassuming simplicity, that even their enemies recognise it. (4) This hypothesis is especially refuted by the remark, that, let the order of the Evangelists be what it will, we are always forced to concede that, in many cases, the later Evangelist not only exchanges the clearer statement of his predecessor for a more defective and inaccurate one, but often apparently, though not actually, contradicts his authority, and that in a manner which must be intentional, since inaccuracy is insufficient to explain it.'

SECTION II.

THE ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS IN GENERAL.

The Christian originality of the Gospels is the decided factor by means of which both their unity and diversity, and the wonderful relation resulting from both, must be explained. But when we would explain this originality, we find ourselves almost induced, with respect to the relation of the Gospels to the actual Gospel history, to attribute to each a peculiar kind of origin. Besides, the conviction is pressed upon us, that each Evangelist has, in the appropriation of his matter, preserved his personal dignity, and by his manner of statement, impressed upon it his own peculiarity. Lastly, we find that each Gospel displays a special arrangement, arising from a peculiar plan, depending on special motives and considerations. Thus we obtain a triple impress of originality in the Gospels: they are original in source, in composition, and in plan. It is no wonder, then, that they who have misconceived their peculiarity in all these respects, should have erred in a threefold manner.

The first factor in the composition of the Gospels, is the peculiarity of the sources whence their material was derived. These, in their full extent, include the following particulars: first, direct remembrance; secondly, tradition; thirdly, written memorabilia; fourthly, already existing Gospels.

It is taking a defective view of the resources of an Evangelist, to set up the tradition-hypothesis alone, without duly estimating the great importance of the direct memory of the apostles. Especially must it be taken into account, as forming the basis of the first Gospel, viz., the original Hebrew Gospel, which was the immediate work of Matthew, and of the Gospel of John. It cannot be wholly, at least, denied to Luke; and Mark is as near to it as he was, during his life, to the Apostle Peter, and to the apostolic church at Jerusalem. The powerful effect of the evangelical memory was, however, in each Evangelist, the very motive that induced the composition of a Gospel.

Direct remembrance was completed by tradition. The transition from one to the other is exemplified in those incidents, for the complete knowledge of which tradition was needed even by

Matthew and John, the actual witnesses of the life of Jesus. Much which appertains to His history—the occurrences of His childhood, of His retirement, and of His private life—could only have been known to His disciples by communication. Not only their former, but even their present vocation, separated them occasionally from Him, so that the information of one would often need completion by the information of another. Thus fragments of memory and tradition formed various combinations, which gained unity from the fact that the memory of each individual disciple was continually excited by, and came in contact with, the general memory of the whole Church. Tradition then, intimately united indeed with apostolic remembrance, appears to have been the actual source of those Evangelists who had had but little, or even no direct intervention in the facts of the Gospel history.

The freshness of this source was maintained by means of the continuous preaching of the Gospel;¹ its purity and brightness, by the Spirit of the Gospel. The agency of this Spirit is of the highest importance in the origin of the Gospels. Without His assistance a disciple could hardly have written a Gospel. He was the remembrancer, not so much with regard to non-essential circumstances, as to the relative distinctness and significance of the several facts of the whole Gospel history. It is in the certainty wherewith He both explains and assumes the perfect actuality of the Gospel history, that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of God. They who are unable to distinguish between the foreboding, myth-forming spirit, and the Holy Spirit hovering over the completed history, and assuming it as the scent does the full-blown flower, have not yet learned to distinguish between the beginning and the climax of the human race; the historical development of tens of centuries is to them a blank. The Evan-

¹ [‘ Out of the countless multitude of Christ’s acts, those were gathered, in the ministry of twenty years, which were seen to have the fullest representative significance for the exhibition of His divine life. The oral collection thus formed became in every sense coincident with the “Gospel;” and our Gospels are the permanent compendium of its contents.’—Westcott’s *Introd.* p. 155. There are few more interesting chapters in the history either of literature or of the Church, than that which treats of the connection of the Gospels with the apostolic preaching; and a more adequate exhibition of it cannot be required than that which has been given by Davidson (vol. i. p. 405 ff.).—ED.]

gelists lived and breathed in the element of this reminding Spirit;—could He then have left them so soon as they began to write Gospels?¹ Hence it was under the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost that the Word of God solemnized also His literary incarnation.

The Gospel-forming tendency first manifested itself in the production of those lesser evangelical memoirs, which many who had enjoyed the privilege of intercourse with Jesus felt themselves impelled to write, in order to preserve any circumstance which seemed either specially remarkable, or which was at least the subject of direct memory. If it be asked, how such or such an apostle managed to keep this or that difficult discourse in his memory, such a question strikes at the questioner himself. If it be further asked, how these Galileans found time and skill to compile the facts of the Gospel history, the fundamental law is lost sight of, that it is a vital energy which sets quills in motion, whether in the bird or the man. Genius gave the pious Hans Sachs and the profound Jacob Böhm no rest; and that was the reason why these worthy shoemakers became such profuse authors. Undoubtedly, the art of writing itself originated in the impulse to preserve what was worthy of record, and not in accidental scribbling. Nay, man even learned to speak more by the urgency of the desire and necessity which he felt to express his thoughts, than by an experimental play upon his organs, or by the imitation of the lower animals. The remarks which have been made against the primitive records of the Old and New Testament revelation, upon the assumption that the art of authorship was not yet sufficiently understood in the world to account for the production of such memoirs, at such times and places, are expressions of the same lack of spiritual perception which asked con-

¹ The older theology, by its doctrine of inspiration, misconceives the fact that the sacred writers were continually filled with the Spirit, and that their actions, whether of spiritual life or spiritual productivity, were free. The abstraction which would separate the inspiration of the Spirit from the inspiration of the life, is somewhat talmudistic. Modern theologians who oppose the doctrine of inspiration, seem to suppose that God's messengers, to whom they concede the assistance of the Spirit in the general carrying out of their vocation in life, suddenly descended to the level of uncalled ordinary authors as soon as they took hold of the pen. According to the first notion, the Spirit forsook them if they did not write; according to the second, if they did.

cerning Jesus, How knoweth this man letters, having never learned? Never could the necessity of preserving glorious experiences by means of writing, have been more deeply felt than amidst the circle of Christ's witnesses. Nay, it may, without exaggeration, be maintained, that if the art of writing had not as yet existed in the world, it must have arisen among them. Those apostolic men were not more the men of their age, than they were the men, or the children, of the Spirit of Jesus.

Even the women who accompanied our Lord, may also have written from their own point of view, that, as priestesses of His Spirit, they might preserve in written records His precious memory. The Spirit of Christ poured out upon His disciples at the completion of His ministry, nay, proceeding from Him at all times, must indeed have often impelled those who were acquainted with His life, to commit to writing some of His sayings and deeds. It is not to be wondered at, that there were many, as St Luke assures us, who took such works in hand. Could the spring-tide of a new religion, nay, of a new humanity, the marriage feast of the reconciliation between heaven and earth, pass by without the guests and witnesses of this glorious life feeling constrained to preserve its most important circumstances in writing? At all events, a multitude of such memoirs did arise. These many lesser primitive Gospels, then, naturally formed the firm and fixed centre of evangelical memory and tradition within the circle of the apostolic Church. It is probable that a selection of such writings as St Luke had to deal with, was at the disposal of each of the Evangelists. These Gospel memoirs form the transition between tradition and those complete Gospels, into which the written announcement of the Gospel has settled. These Gospels arose one after another during a short period of time, and within a circumscribed sphere. Hence it may have been possible that one Evangelist was acquainted with the work of another, that the later might make use of the labours of the former. Mark might perhaps have known that of Luke, or at all events the Hebrew original of Matthew. According to tradition, John was acquainted with all the synoptical Gospels.

When we take into account the true communion of the Spirit in the apostolic Church, and the manner in which the life of Christ was interwoven into its life, we can easily understand

how, from all the various sources, a living unity of general tradition, a special manner of viewing and narrating the Gospel history, would be formed, in which all the apostles and Evangelists would have more or less resemblance to each other. The Spirit of their faith, of their blessedness, of their worship, who made them all to be of one heart and of one soul, formed a mutual and most delicate *rappor*t, in which the very phraseology of the Gospel, the whole manner of its announcement, received a peculiar and singular stamp. This unity of view and statement, occasioned as it was by oneness of spirit, supreme simplicity, memory, mutual co-operation, and common written authorities, was the cause of that extraordinary unity which is perceived in the narratives and style of the Gospels, and especially of the synoptical Gospels.

This phenomenon is therefore caused by the marvellous agency of the Spirit of sacred Gospel remembrance in the primitive apostolic Church. Hence, they who look upon the precious fruit, which bears witness to the fulness of apostolic vitality, as the mere dead production of the poorest kind of compilation, are soon puzzled by the fact, that the originality of the several Evangelists everywhere animates this admirable unity, by touches of the richest variety. The critic would fain seize and handle this living unity as a mere dead uniformity; but when the rich play of Gospel individuality which forms its other side is perceived, his peace is at an end, and the terrible problem drives him like a restless spirit through the region of hypotheses.

It is part of the notion of Christianity, that by its sanctifying operations it should awaken and bring to perfection, on one hand, the whole unity of individualities; on the other, their entire variety. Hence the four Gospels contribute, even in their form, to the glorification of the Christian spirit, by exhibiting in large and plastic forms that vital congruity by which the Christian spirit is proved to be such. Hence the sacred originality of the Evangelists may be designated as the second factor of the Gospels, and of the peculiarity of their mutual relations. The authenticity of the four Gospels being assumed, it might fairly be expected that each should exhibit a definite and significant character. This is involved, first, in the notion of such evangelists as the Church could appropriate. Evangelists of such a kind could not but be prominent characters, and must conse-

quently express themselves in a characteristic manner. But it is also involved in the notion of the mature primitive Christian, that he should exhibit his peculiarity in his work; for the spirit of Christianity, by means of its horror of annihilation, introduces individuality into a new life, and causes it to appear in the full glory of its definiteness. But if important characters appear in their full freedom, they will be distinguished from each other by strong peculiarity of feature. Thus the Gospels must be looked upon as the writings of distinct, important, and definite characters. It is by the exhibition of their originality that they manifest themselves to be the effects of such original forces. Hence each must of necessity appear in its full peculiarity; and that criticism which would pass sentence upon them without a notion of this circumstance, must, for that very reason, be characterized as incapable or unchristian. But when it goes so far as to attribute the delicate manifestations of vital originality found in the Gospels to death, all that play of feature pertaining to living personality to the convulsive efforts of paralysed and half-dead individuals, such representations arise as those which make, *e.g.*, the ardent expressions of Mark, choice 'printing'—the deeply significant and lyrically beautiful impulses of John, tedious prolixities. A true appreciation of the Gospels must be preceded by an appreciation of their writers. In this place, however, we can but state this principle, and must treat of the characteristics of the several Evangelists in another part of this work.

But, finally, when we remember that the great characters who wrote the Gospels attained their powers of Gospel authorship by means of definite and special occasions for their exercise in Christian interaction with various persons and circumstances, we have already admitted a third factor in the production and form of the Gospels. The character of the Evangelist is neither an egotistical nor a vanishing one. It is on one side infinitely defined, and therefore, on the other, infinitely definable. Love makes him so pliable, that though ever building on the same foundation, he becomes all things to all men; that he preaches quite differently at Athens and at Corinth, for this very reason, that he everywhere preaches the same truth in its essential spirit, while adapting its form to the varying circumstances of his audience. If then we take this Christian principle into

account, we cannot but view the peculiar form of each separate Gospel as resulting from the peculiar spiritual state of those for whom the Evangelist wrote. If due allowance is made for this factor, it will be perhaps better understood, *e.g.*, why the Gospel of John and Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians exhibit so much relationship. This reference of each Gospel to the circle for whom it was first destined, will explain the Old Testament references of Matthew, the sharply defined pictures of Mark, intended as they were for the practical mind of the Roman, the catholic characteristics of Luke, and the ideal and theologic views of John. The Pauline Epistles show how variously the various necessities and receptive powers of the different churches could affect the one forcible and determined pen of a Paul. And thus must the various constellations in the kingdom of God have still more powerfully influenced the Evangelists, who, according to the law of liberty, of special vocation, and of love, devoted themselves each to special circles of readers. By the interaction of such situations with the characters of the several Evangelists, were formed, under the leading of the Divine Spirit, the plans of the several Gospels, whose immediate and intended destination was impressed not only on their fundamental characteristics, but also on their separate features; so that, even in this respect, each separate Gospel could not but receive a different physiognomy.

NOTE.

The Evangelist Luke has, in the introduction to his Gospel, pointed out the various stages of general Gospel tradition. (1) Direct tradition, represented by the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται. (2) The transition from memory to tradition. The ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται are emphatically so called, and form, as it seems, as eye-witnesses from the beginning of the life of Christ, a contrast to those who were only αὐτόπται, etc., during a shorter period, and who seem denoted by the word ἡμεῖς. (3) Tradition, in a narrower sense, pointed out by the words: παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν. (4) Memoirs; πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν, etc. The ἐπεχείρησαν seems to designate not so much the boldness of the attempt, or the insufficiency of the execution, as the first rudiments of Gospel composition.¹ (5) The formation of the

¹ [Westcott (p. 173 of his *Introd.*) acutely remarks, 'He finds no fault

comprehensive Gospel: *ἔδοξε καὶ μοι*, etc.—Thus the first factor in the formation of a Gospel is stated in its full extent: the second and third are sufficiently indicated in the third and fourth verses.

SECTION III.

ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS IN PARTICULAR.

The various factors which operated in the production of the Gospels, took various forms, exerted various degrees of power, and consequently produced various kinds of interaction in the life of each separate Evangelist. Hence the sum of their effects could not but be different in each particular case. This total sum of effects is formed by the motive, the plan, of each Gospel, and by the germ which gives to each its own special form of development.

The simplest motive was the cause of the Gospel of Mark. We here behold an Evangelist who deals rather in vivid and copious representation than in profound doctrines and views, seizing with the ardour and animation of youth upon the Gospel tradition, and depicting in lively traits the ministerial life of Christ. But the tradition of the Gospel history which guided him, had already taken, through the statements and views of Peter, a special form exactly corresponding to his requirements; for the style of this versatile Evangelist's narrative is, from the very first, determined by the lively views of this ardent and congenial, but stronger apostle, who, equally with himself, displays a preference for the concrete. Besides, this Evangelist was urged to write his Gospel by Romans, and indeed by single members of the Roman Church. The Roman Church, as such, must have expected from him a statement of the facts of the life of Jesus; but the wish of individuals, as such, would impel him more especially to a presentation of his matter in pictorial scenes; and the result would be just such a Gospel as we have in the second. Mark narrates events in his own manner; his ardent with the basis on which the earlier writers rested. His own determination is placed on an equal footing with theirs (*ἔδοξε καὶ μοι*).—ED.]

and lively imagination is everywhere manifested in his Gospel. He derived his information from the apostolic discourses of Peter, which dispensed with the chronological connection of events for the sake of blending them with doctrinal announcements. Hence a strict historical sequence is wanting in this Gospel.¹ His narrative was written for a circle of Roman Christians; hence he confined himself so much to the concrete, and made use of many Latin words and phrases. From the circumstance that his inducement to write arose from a private circle, the double conclusion of his Gospel may be in some measure explained. His communications, that is to say, were gradually formed: how naturally, then, might a cessation take place towards the close, and a subsequent completion be added, after the dissemination of the former communications! Criticism, in its oscillations between opposite extremes, has at one time too highly estimated, at another too much depreciated, this Evangelist and his Gospel in comparison with the other Gospels. Even Augustine caused this Gospel to be misconceived, by regarding Mark as ‘the follower and abridger’ (*pedissequus et breviator*) of Matthew.² Euthymius Zigabenus pronounces a similar opinion.³ In modern times Michaelis has remarked, that ‘Mark wrote with Matthew’s Gospel in his hand;’ and afterwards, that Luke also made use of it. Hereupon Griesbach sought to prove⁴ that ‘the whole Gospel of Mark, with the exception of a few verses, is derived from Matthew and Luke.’ Saunier, in his work *über die Quellen des Evangeliums des Markus*, 1825, *Theile zur Biographie Jesu*, p. 34, Strauss in the *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 78, and others, have embraced this opinion. Even Ammon agrees on the whole with this view of the Gospels.

Erroneous notions of the second Gospel were first attacked

¹ Even Credner, in his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, p. 123, shares Schleiermacher’s view: that the description given of the presbyter John by Papias, according to which Mark did not write *τάξις*, does not suit our Evangelist. He remarks that this Gospel preserves the same order as Matthew and Luke, and that they therefore who would nevertheless refer the expression of ‘John the presbyter’ to Mark, do at the same time impugn the chronology of Matthew and Luke. At all events, the chronology of Matthew and Luke is corrected by the Gospel of John.

² *De consensu evang.* i. 2.

³ Comp. Ammon, *die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, p. 69.

⁴ *Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium totum e Matthæi et Lucæ commentariis decerptum esse demonstratur* (*Opusc. acad.* vol. 2).

in a doctrinal point of view by Mill and Wolf. When a contradiction was felt to exist between the doctrine of inspiration and the assumption that Mark was a mere 'follower' of Matthew, such a persuasion involved the true notion, that an Evangelist, as such, was too truly invested with the dignity of a definite, an inspired, and an apostolic life, too powerfully impelled to work in the strength and blessing of his own special spiritual gift, to exhibit the mere lifeless performance of a compiler or copyist. It was subsequently owned, that the Gospel of Mark could not be wholly accounted for by that of Matthew, but that it assumed a more comprehensive evangelical tradition. Koppe especially embraced this view. The recognition of the peculiarity of this Gospel was gradually prepared for, as may be remarked in Schott's *Isagoge*, etc., p. 90. Nay, Mark was indemnified for the misconception he had experienced, by this view being surpassed, and his Gospel made the basis of those of Matthew and Luke, which has been done in our days by both Wilke¹ and Weisse,² after the precedent of Herder and Storr. Finally, credit for the greatest things has been given to this Evangelist, by attributing to him the Apocalypse also.³

That the originality of Mark makes him independent of Matthew and Luke, may be seen from his omissions, not to mention the characteristic vividness of delineation pervading his whole work. On the other hand, however, the originality of the second Gospel can derogate nothing from that of the first and third, which not only surpass Mark in extent, *i.e.*, in reporting certain circumstances which he has omitted, but also in the more significant and profound sequence and tone of their communications.

Nothing material can be urged against the tradition of the fathers, according to which Mark composed his Gospel at Rome, about the time of Peter's martyrdom. The variety of their statements may perhaps be accounted for by the various editions of this Gospel. According to Clement of Alexandria and Euse-

¹ *Der Urevangelist, oder exeg. krit. Untersuchung über das Verwandtschaftsverhältniss der drei ersten Evangelien*, Dresden und Leipzig 1838.

² *Die evang. Geschichte*, vol. i.

³ Hitzig, *Ueber Johannes Markus und seine Schriften, oder: welcher Johannes hat die Offenbarung verfasst*, Zurich 1843.

bis, Mark composed his Gospel during the life of Peter; hence the edition which Eusebius followed was one wherein the conclusion, chap. xvi. 9-20, was wanting. Irenæus makes the Evangelist write after the death of Peter; consequently he used a later edition, which included the conclusion.

While Mark sketched vivid pictures from the Gospel history from a Petrine point of view for Roman Christians, Matthew undertook the task of composing a Gospel for Hebrew Christians. His disposition and official vocation equally impelled him to such a work. He could not but lead his fellow-believers in the Old and New Testaments to the heights of the theocratic standpoint, and show them the fulfilment (the *πλήρωσις*) of the Old Testament in the New. Hence his Gospel is, as to matter, filled with references to the Old Testament; as to form, with Hebraisms. Hence he is constrained to represent the Messiah in the great acts of His historical manifestation, and so to arrange them as to make them act, as far as possible, in their totality as credentials of His dignity. Hence so prominent a position is occupied in the beginning of this Gospel by the genealogy, and at its close by the announcement of the destruction of Jerusalem. In striking contrast, however, to that genuine Israelitism, the line of Messianic life appearing in the person and institution of Christ, must that false tradition of Israelite nature, viz. Pharisaism, be exhibited. This foundation of the Gospel of Matthew was from the first so firmly laid, that its Greek compiler could alter nothing essential, without intentionally destroying the execution of this significant design.¹

The birth-place of this Gospel must at all events have been Palestine. The date of its origin is probably that when, by reason of the storm then gathering over Jerusalem, the Christians began, according to their Master's injunctions, to leave the Jewish commonwealth, sunk as it was in delusion, and to emigrate chiefly to Pella.²

Luke wrote his Gospel under the influence of his Pauline tendencies. Hence he stood in direct opposition, not only to inimical Judaism, but also to morbid judaized Christianity.

¹ Comp. Credner, *Einleitung*, pp. 62, 63.

² According to Irenæus, *adv. Hæres.* 3, 11, Matthew wrote his Gospel while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel in Rome. This remark points to the same period.

This standpoint gave him a special sense for all those incidents in the Gospel history, in which the calling of the whole Gentile world into the kingdom of God appears. Hence a stronger feature of catholicity pervades his Gospel. It also satisfactorily proves that the supposed discoveries, according to which this Gospel contains Ebionite views needing to be expunged, are entire failures. Luke wrote the history of the divine Friend, the Shepherd, the Saviour, of the human race. In carrying out this task, a number of written notices of the life of Jesus were at his disposal. Some of these pieces he allowed to produce their full effect, by incorporating them in his work without materially altering them. But he could not feel himself bound, in the task of editing such documents as had come to his knowledge, to follow exactly the succession of events in the Gospel history from its commencement, as he certainly might have done, partly by the help of tradition, and partly perhaps by that of his own memory (*παρακολουθεῖν ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς*, chap. i. 3).¹ His peculiarity has imparted its tinge to his whole Gospel, though we cannot but feel how differently he would have written, if he had not been guided by the distinct impress of Gospel tradition.² He wrote his Gospel, first, for Theophilus, a Christian of some consideration, who at the same time represents, in his view, a class of Christians who, both by education and the solicitude they evinced on the subject, had a better right than many others to require such a history of Christ's life as, being founded upon accurate information, might afford them certainty (*ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*). When, then, Luke promises Theophilus that he would write the Gospel history in order, *καθεξῆς*, we are led to expect that he meant thereby the accurately ascertained chronological sequence. But when we view the actual state of the case, and remark that he observes this historical sequence only in general, and not in his delineation of Christ's ministry; that, on the contrary, he brings prominently forward another kind of order, namely, that of Christ's continual journeyings; we cannot but suppose that this

¹ Compare Schleiermacher: *Ueber die Schriften Lukas*, Berlin 1817. With great penetration and delicate perception, has Schleiermacher pointed out the primitive basis of this Gospel, though he certainly makes the Evangelist play too much the part of a mere compiler.

² See Credner, 132.

was the order which he intended from the first. Other writers of Gospels had already attempted to set forth in order (*ἀνατάξασθαι*) the Gospel history, according to certain principles of arrangement: this, however, was to be his principle, to communicate to Theophilus the Gospel history in a previously determined order, of which the journeys of Christ should form the leading idea.¹

The date of this Gospel is probably an early one: perhaps about that of St Paul's first imprisonment at Rome. At all events, it is antecedent to that of the Acts of the Apostles. There must, however, always be a difficulty in supposing that Luke discontinued this latter book at a place where he might have carried it on much further, namely, at the time when Paul had lived two years at Rome.

The Evangelist John had, according to a tradition which there is no reasonable ground for doubting, the synoptical Gospels before him, when he composed his own. Hence he did not concern himself with directly communicating such parts of the Gospel history as were already known. But the history of the life of Jesus had, through the operation of the recalling Spirit, become to his profound and delicate mind, more than to any other apostle, the history of the Incarnate Logos, the centre of the ideal world. That centre of civilisation² in which it was his

¹ Compare, on the introduction to Luke's Gospel, Gfrörer, *die h. Sage*, Pt. i. p. 33.

² The Church tradition according to which the Apostle John exercised the office of bishop and ended his life at Ephesus, in Asia Minor, has been opposed, as being without foundation, by Lutzberger, in his essay *Die kirchliche Tradition*, etc. This tradition is, however, independently of its own value, accredited by Irenæus (*Contra hæres.* iii. 3), and still more decidedly by certain ancient writings, in which the Asiatic churches of the second century, in their contentions with the Romish Church concerning Easter, appeal to the authority of the Apostle John. These are, chiefly, the letter of Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, to Victor, Bishop of Rome (Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* v. 24), and the letter of Irenæus to Victor, according to which Polycarp also appeals to the Apostle, John in opposition to the Romish Bishop Anicetus. What then has Lutzberger to oppose to this? Schweigger (*Theol. Jahrbücher von Zeller*, No. 2, p. 289) points out as his most important arguments: (1.) An explanation of Gal. ii. 6, according to which, it is said to follow from *ὅποῖός ποτε ἦσαν*, that John was already dead when the Epistle to the Galatians was written. (2.) The hypothesis, that by the 'disciple whom Jesus loved,' spoken of in the fourth Gospel, we are to

lot to represent the Church of Christ, induced him to form his confession of Christ into an ideal Christology. He was, however, impelled to this full development of his views by the two-fold manner in which the worldly spirit, which had entered the Church, had deformed Christian doctrine; hence its mature form resulted from its contest with the first beginnings of Ebionitism and Gnosticism. The Evangelist had consequently the opportunity of forming his Christology with special reference to the inimical contrasts which it had to encounter in the world. Hence arose that fundamental idea of his Gospel, which has already been stated. If the synoptical Evangelists had spared him the task of narrating Gospel facts, they had, on the other hand, prepared another task for him, by their neglect of chronological sequence in their several delineations of the Gospel history. In this respect, therefore, John was induced not only to give it decided prominence in his Gospel, but also to depict more copiously the commencement of Christ's ministry, which his predecessors had but slightly touched on. It was peculiar to his mind to view the general in the prominence of the particular. Hence the more important incidents of the Gospel history, in which, on the one hand, the reception which the light of the world experienced from 'His own,' and, on the other, the repulse by which 'the darkness' excluded itself therefrom, were most decidedly expressed and carried out, occupied the foreground in this view. Thus ideal Christology, the ideal and real life of Christ represented, with reference to both the friendly and inimical treatment it met with in the world, in an orderly succession of its most striking incidents, formed the plan of his Gospel. John could not have arrived in Ephesus before he had reached an advanced age. Here, however, he found himself within the influence of just such inducements, whether arising from favourable or opposing circumstances, as were calculated to mature within his mind the form of his Gospel.

understand, not John, but Andrew. Schwegeler speedily and completely confutes both these assertions. It is being over scrupulous to suppose, that allowing John to have been Bishop of Ephesus is equivalent to admitting that he failed to execute his missionary vocation; for the mission of the apostles was not only to be diffusive over the earth's surface, but concentrated in its important places.

NOTE.

According to the conclusions at which criticism has as yet arrived, the Evangelists appear before us as figures which, like mysterious spirits, freely and easily pass through its attacks, because critics are entangled in endless and often mortal contests with each other. Thus, at one time, it is said that the author of Matthew's Gospel not only frequently copied from Mark, and was thus externally dependent upon him, but also frequently misunderstood him, as being wholly unacquainted with the Hebrew manner of thought and expression (comp. Hitzig, *Ueber Johannes Markus*, p. 47); that he has irrevocably forfeited the credit of an eye-witness (Strauss, *Leben Jesu* ii. 309); nay, that his Gospel, in its present form, is no apostolical testimony at all (Credner, *Einleitung*, p. 95).

Then, again, the collection of sayings by the Apostle Matthew, said to form the basis of the first Gospel, is declared to be, with respect to the authenticity, trustworthiness, and genuineness of its communications, in every way equal to the communications of Mark (Weisse, *d. evang. Gesch.* vol. ii. p. 1); and these sayings are said to have been copied with almost verbal accuracy (*Id.* vol. i. p. 109). Again, this Gospel, it is asserted, exhibits very plainly the characteristics of its Jewish origin (Hase, *Leben Jesu*, p. 4). At one time Matthew is looked upon as the author of the Gospel, but the Gospel is considered a fiction (see Bauer, *Krit. der evang. Gesch.*); at another, the Gospel is credible, and even derived as a translation from the primitive Aramæan Gospel, but has been ascribed, without valid historical ground, to Matthew (see Ammon, *die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, vol. i. p. 61); nay, this Gospel, independently of its pretensions to the authority of an apostle and eye-witness, is placed before those of Mark and Luke (Theile, *zur Biographie Jesu*, p. 35). Now Mark appears as a compiler, making a selection from Matthew and Luke (Theile, *zur Biog. Jesu*, p. 34; Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 78), and only a few verses are allowed to be original (Griesbachii *Opusc.* vol. ii.). Then, again, Mark is the founder of the whole family of synoptical Gospels (Wilke, Weiss, etc.). His statements are said to be reproduced, after being levelled and flattened, in the other Gospels; his views are independent, his chronological arrangement his own (Hitzig, as above, p. 46).

Not only are the synoptical Gospels founded upon his, but the Apocalypse is also his work. With respect to Luke, at one time, there is not sufficient ground for attributing to him the Gospel bearing his name. A doubt is even cast upon the testimony that it was the production of a companion of St Paul. In any case, the companion of St Paul may have composed his work among accumulations of tradition, from which no apostolic influence protected him (Strauss, *Leben Jesu* i. 80). Too much honour is done to the author of this work, when the attempt is made to bring any of his statements into harmony with chronology (*Id.* p. 265). In the case of Luke, historical accuracy is, seriously speaking, entirely out of the question (Weisse, vol. i. p. 90). At another time this same Evangelist is represented as a Christian investigator, whose credit is not diminished but increased by referring his work to the earlier works of original and gifted eye-witnesses of the events (Schleiermacher, *Ueber die Schriften des Lukas* xvi.). Again, we cannot mistake the more cultivated Hellenist in him. The tradition, that he committed to writing the Gospel preached by Paul, is strikingly corroborated by comparing certain passages in Paul's Epistles with parallel passages in this Gospel, especially the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper (Gieseler, *historisch kritischer Versuch*, p. 124). Finally, the Apostle John is, by a critical bias, gradually removed from the list of Evangelists. According to B. Bauer, the unnamed disciple, who has been supposed to be this apostle, is only a phantom formed by the fourth Evangelist (*Kritik* iii. 340). According to Lutzelberger, the Gospel itself is infected with crude dualistic assumptions, and is therefore of Manichæan tendency (*Die kirchl. Trad.* p. 286). According to Gfrörer, on the contrary (*Das Heiligthum und die Wahrheit*, p. 346), the work of the fourth Evangelist is not only genuine, but he has performed his task 'as well as could have been expected.' According to Credner, only an inhabitant of Palestine, an immediate eye-witness and an apostle, only the beloved disciple of the Lord Jesus, only that very John whom Jesus had bound to Himself by the heavenly charm of His teaching, could have been the author of such a Gospel (*Einleitung*, p. 208).

PART VII.

THE RELATION OF THE FOUR GOSPELS TO THE GOSPEL HISTORY.

SECTION I.

AN ATTEMPT TO EXHIBIT THE GOSPEL HISTORY IN ITS UNITY.

THE Gospel history has ever presented itself, in its essential features, to the eye of Christian faith as a unity. Faith has ever found the Gospel in the Gospels. It is one of the marks of matured believers, that Christ has been formed in them. They have an enlightened spiritual perception of His nature and history. Their knowledge must, from its very nature, be ever increasing in clearness and fulness. But it has not come to perfection until all the essential contents of the Gospel history, as found in the four Gospels, have their place in the harmonious image resulting from this one perception of the life of Christ. And faith is striving after the same end as theological science, when the latter is seeking to exhibit that unity from the four Gospels.

But both in the assumption on which this effort is founded, and in the process whereby it is to be realized, science may depart from the point of view occupied by faith. At all events, science must differ from faith at every step of this effort in this respect, that while faith is rejoicing in the spiritual unity she has found in the life of Christ, science is endeavouring to exhibit this unity in the fulness of those historical features displayed in the Gospels. Consequently, while faith has ever rejoiced in the unity of Christ as experienced at its centre, the high aim of science has ever been, and still is to exhibit its whole circumference.

This effort of science cannot but be regarded as the expres-

sion of a noble and essential impulse of the mind. The mind everywhere seeks unity, whether in history or nature ; it cannot but seek it, because its own nature is the free unity of varieties. Variety, indeed, cannot oppress it, so long as it can either perceive or anticipate therein the fulness of unity. But if variety seems to obstruct unity by its mysterious nature, or to obliterate it by obvious contradictions, the mind becomes uneasy and excited, and finally seeks it at any cost. The moral and religious capacity for discovering unity in variety is indeed very various. The Monotheist, *e.g.*, finds in the infinite variety of the world the bright and certain manifestation of one Spirit ; the Polytheist finds therein the confused separateness of countless gods. The former finds unity because he goes to the cause ; the latter loses it because he is prejudiced by the outward effect. So also will a strong, healthy, evangelical mind see the unity of the Gospel in all the Gospels ; while a mind fixed upon outward matters of detail and of the letter, fancies it discovers a complication of contradictions.

Even in their assumption concerning the relation of the four Gospels to the one Gospel history, the decisions of science and faith are often widely different. Christian faith cannot but regard it as an advantage to possess the Gospel in this four-field form and development ; science, on the contrary, is almost accustomed to see in this circumstance a deficiency, an injury. The former would not part with one of the Gospels, because each serves more clearly to display the infinite riches of Christ in a special aspect ; science, on the contrary, seems often inclined to give up all four, for the first best scientific representation of the life of Christ, or even for a negative criticism of the evangelical narratives.¹

This difference is still more strikingly displayed in the respective methods of procedure of these two mental tendencies. While faith finds the same Christ and the same presiding Spirit of Christ in each separate occurrence of the Gospel narratives, and even looks upon discrepancies in details as corroborations of the truth and freedom of this spirit, the scientific impulse, which is more or less alien to faith, desires the perfect

¹ [‘ M. Renan a voulu, comme il le dit, nous faire lire un cinquieme evangile, extrait des quatre autres.’—Pressensé, *L'Ecole Critique et Jésus Christ*, p. 14.—ED.]

external unity, or even uniformity, of the evangelical narratives. This impulse, in its Christian form, produces that positive harmony which regards the external accordance of the Gospels as a condition of their internal agreement, or indeed confounds the two, and makes faith dependent upon the fact of the Gospels exhibiting the lawyer-like exactness of a statute-book. In its non-Christian form, however, this same impulse produces negative harmony, which finds not only in actual discrepancies of detail between the several Gospels, but even in every mere appearance of discrepancy that can be raked up, signs of their legendary nature. Both kinds of harmony suffer from the same lack of feeling for the vividness with which mind is wont to express itself, and terminate in a complete talmudistic minute criticism with respect to the externals of the Gospels, corresponding with their utter misconception of their inner life. These two forms of harmony stand in the same polar relation to each other as Popery and Separatism, or as despotism and anarchy. The one annihilates the peculiarity of the Gospels, to exhibit more forcibly the uniformity of the Gospel; the other, on the contrary, denies the powerful unity of spirit manifest in every feature of the separate Gospels, and sees in them an endless complication of apocryphal mental activity, living particles capriciously jumbled together from every quarter.

It is the problem of faith ever more and more to introduce the separate features of the Gospel narratives, viewed in their mutual harmonious relations, into the Church's contemplation of the life of Jesus, viewed as a whole. It is the problem of theological science, on the contrary, ever more and more to strive, by successive approximations, to exhibit from the materials at hand the perfect unity of the life of Jesus. When the tasks of both are completed, both must meet at the same place. But, meanwhile, faith cannot exact of science that she should hurry her task, or even, with lawyer-like partiality, solve her problem at any cost, as though she were concerned to save the life of a threatened client. Such an exaction was indeed long ago made by little faith, till science, which she had enslaved, breaking through her bonds, thenceforth conducted the cause of the Gospels in an opposite direction, with the vindictive spirit of a fugitive slave. When, however, science would, on her part, enforce upon faith results which assume and involve another

view of the world than the Christian one, she must in this form appear to faith under the same aspect as Jewish or Moham-medan arguments would, when dealing in an antichristian manner with the Gospels. Such science no longer stands in polar relationship to faith, but has nothing to do with it. Christian science starts from the assumption of the central unity of the four Gospels. She seeks to follow this vital unity of spirit into the very veins of their several details. Having, however, to deal with the analysis of four great individualities in their respective performances, and in their relation to the Gospel history, her task seems an endless one. But it is not only the subject itself which makes this task a difficult one. In estimating it, we must also take into account the imperfect state of science, both as being still in process of development, and limited by human weakness. Hence her several decisions are arrived at without the confidence of full assurance. Nothing could more retard her progress than to convert her conclusions or views into settled maxims. The more cautiously she proceeds, the more assurance may she express, because she proceeds upon the certainty of a firm foundation, and has the certainty of a real end in view. It is in this sense that our attempt to give a single delineation of the Gospel history is to be made. With regard to the extent of this representation, it will, for the sake of obtaining a comprehensive view of the whole subject, go beyond the limits of the four Gospels, *e.g.*, with regard to a description of the secular circumstances among which the life of Jesus was passed. With regard to its execution, however, this representation will consist only of a sketch of the subject, since the full consideration of the matter will be given in the development of the four separate Gospels.

SECTION II.

THE GOSPEL HISTORY, IN THE ORGANIC FOURFOLD DEVELOPMENT OF ITS FULNESS.

The life of the world arises from a fundamental principle, and propagates itself in an infinite variety of forces, forms, and

aspects. Proceeding from variety, and seeking this fundamental principle, man appears in his ideality as the centre of life, the idea of the world, according to which all other forms are regulated. When we would contemplate the highest forms of animal life, the last steps of the pedestal on which that life which forms creation's statue is exalted, these appear to be the ox, the sacrificial animal, the type of suffering and bleeding life; the lion, the type of ruling, royally free life; the eagle, the type of sacred, contemplative life, soaring above the earth. Above these three heights of animal life, man appears as the image of spiritual life, reproducing all these grades in a higher unity (Rev. iv. 7). Man is the suffering being, who goes through all the woe of the world to its very depths, formed for submission to his fate, the child of sacred sorrow, the ox, the sacrificial animal, *μόσχος*, like the *τράγος* or scape-goat, which tragedy symbolically denotes. Man is the royal being, who judicially rules the world, and perpetrates the slaughter of his victims with fierce or joyful enthusiasm. Man is finally the eagle of spiritual enlightenment, flying towards the sun, and viewing all things in the light of the spirit,—the eagle of a contemplation which soars far beyond empiricism. But when man answers to his destiny, and is equal to himself, he is all these at once: he is the tragic sacrificial animal, the contending and victorious lion, the contemplative eagle, loving to abide in the light; he is all in one, and it is in this unity that he is man.

These typical forms of animal life, together with their spiritual unity, man, form the deep-meaning theocratic symbol described in the vision of the prophet Ezekiel (chap. i.), and also in the Apocalypse (chap. iv.). In the symbol of the cherubim above the ark of the covenant, the Israelite beheld the glory of God as reflected in the fulness of the world, the unity of life as it branches out into diversity of form. All that lives belongs to the spirit, is forfeited and sacrificed thereto: this is denoted by the ox. All that lives, enjoys, struggles, conquers, because it represents spirit; this is expressed by the lion. All that lives, loves to float in visionary intoxication in the sunlight; this is the form of life represented by the eagle. But all that lives, reaches its climax in man; the spiritualization of suffering, of action, of contemplation, form

in him a unity; and from this unity arises the fourth typical form of life, humanity.¹

We have seen in the preceding part of this work that Christ is the perfect, the glorified man, the God-man. As then man in general spreads abroad his fulness in the world, so does the God-man in the Gospel, the instrument of the world's enlightenment. And as the fulness of man, as man, ramifies in the world, so does the fulness of Christ ramify itself in the Gospels. Irenæus displayed a happy fertility of presentiment, when he found in the peculiarity of the four Gospels, a reference to the four living creatures in Ezekiel.

The assumption that one single man, in one single work, would have furnished a better delineation of the life of Jesus than four different chosen Evangelists, who complete each other and form one united whole, is equivalent to the view that the personality of Christ might, in its depth and extent, be repeated in other persons, though in weaker forms. But how could He then, as the one Head, stand in true organic unity with His various members? The unity of life spreads abroad its infinite fulness in the four typical forms of life. So is it also with the unity of the life of Christ. It was determined in the counsel of God, and provided for by the Spirit of God, that the life of Christ should be viewed by great but different, separate but concurrent, apostolic characters, and that it should in the same manner be committed to writing by four Evangelists.²

Hence we cannot scientifically know the life of Jesus in all its fulness, nor learn the extent of the effect it produced, unless we are intimately acquainted with it, as represented in the four Evangelists. But even in this case we shall only seek and find the Gospel in its fulness, when, on the one hand, we find in the four Gospels the true unity of the Gospel history, and, on the other, learn to appreciate and understand each expression of the Gospel, in the series of the four Evangelists, in its own definite peculiarity.

Each Evangelist had his special province and gift of grace,

¹ Compare Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, vol. i. p. 360. Though the ox 'was to all nations the emblem of procreative and active power,' yet it might well have another signification in the theocratic realm. Moreover each animal was here a moral symbol. [See Fairbairn's *Typology* i. 222 (3d ed.), and George Smith's *Doctrine of the Cherubim*.—ED.]

² Compare Olshausen, *Commentary on the Gospels*, vol. i. p. 4.

by means of which he was to apprehend and represent the Gospel.¹ And that each was faithful to his appointed task, is evident from the accordance between the characters of the Evangelists as we become acquainted with them from the Gospel history, and the peculiarities of those Gospels which they severally composed. As, for instance, St Mark's Gospel is, with respect to its general character, rightly called 'The Gospel;' so also is it, with respect to its peculiarity, rightly called 'St Mark's.' This accordance between the Gospels and the known characters of the Evangelists to whom they are ascribed, is at the same time a very important testimony to their authenticity. We are not, however, now regarding this accordance with respect to the authenticity of the Gospels, but as opening our eyes to the fact, that to each Evangelist was given a special and peculiar view of the glory of Christ.²

Matthew, the apostle of Christ, who is several times included in the apostolic catalogue, and for the last time in Acts i. 13, was formerly a receiver of customs by the Lake of Gennesareth. According to the united testimony of the synoptical Gospels (Matt. ix. 9, etc.; Mark ii. 13, etc.; Luke v. 27, etc.), he was called by Jesus from the receipt of custom to the apostolate. Though the disciple thus called is named Levi by both Mark and Luke, yet there is not the slightest doubt that they intend the same person whom the first Gospel designates Matthew. As a receiver of custom, Matthew must have possessed a certain amount of social education; especially it may be presumed, that he had gained a facility in writing, and was accustomed to the practice of this art. Both the administration of public business and the financial management of private business necessitate systematic arrangement. The public official is obliged to arrange and methodize his business, and consequently to use titles, rules, and indices. Hence Matthew was accustomed to systematize.³ And

¹ Compare the work of F. Sander, *Etwas über den eigenthümlichen Plan dem die vier Evangelisten bei der Abfassung ihrer Evangelien gefolgt sind. Essen bei Budeker*, 1827; Ebrard, *Gospel History*, p. 66 ff.

² Comp. my article on the authenticity of the four Gospels, *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1839, i. 7.

³ It has been remarked, that it is questionable whether publicans who farmed the public taxes actually kept accounts, after the practice of modern tax-gatherers. But this is not the question. The impulse to arrange and

it was consistent with such a habit, that in his written delineation of events, he should be accurate in his statements of the essential, and neglect the graphic and the reflective.

As a publican, Matthew was at variance with the pharisaic party, and the pharisaic disposition among his own people. The dictum of the orthodox Jew designated him as unclean. He must have shared the contempt in which his fellow-publicans were held, and had undoubtedly often experienced it on special occasions. Such constant misconception and neglect with regard to religion, could only be regarded with indifference, through frivolous carelessness, or a more liberal piety and more vital comprehension of the Old Testament. It must have been in the latter respect that Matthew had become free from the power of Pharisaism. Otherwise Jesus, even though He had stopped him in his wild career, brought him to salvation, and won him for His kingdom, would hardly have placed him so early among the Twelve. We conclude then that he was a pious Israelite, prepared for the acknowledgment of Christ by an intimate acquaintance with the Old Testament, and that, being at the same time one of those who were of a freer turn of mind than their contemporaries, he had a feeling of the difference between the law of the Lord and the traditions of the fathers. And if we entertain the reasonable view, that Jesus admitted among the Twelve only those more important and prominent characters in whom natural qualifications for a great work already existed, we must assume, in the case of Matthew also, an important personality.

But the fact of his conversion from a publican into an apostle of the Lord, in whom he recognised the true eternal King of Israel, must have been indelibly impressed upon his mind as a miracle of divine grace. He was despised in the eyes of the false theocrats of Israel, and the true Theocrat thus highly exalted him. He must have learned to feel the contrast between the true and the spurious kingdom of God in all their respective aspects. But even without taking into account the unreasonable contempt of the Pharisees, his former doubtful calling, when compared with his present exalted vocation; his former associates, who consisted partly of the most degraded of men, when contrasted with the consecrated circle in which he classify, arises from the necessity of order, and this arises from any official employment.

now lived; and finally, his former, when compared with his present state of mind; must all have appeared to him in their darkest colours. He was translated from a condition of the deepest shame to one of the highest honour—from a most critical to a most advantageous position. Hence it would accord with such a state of things, that a strong feeling for contrasts should have been formed in him.

Thus Matthew comes before us as a pious and unprejudiced, a resolute and educated, a seriously-minded and important Israelite. The true historical connection of Christianity with pure Old Testament Judaism, as well as the contrast between it and Judaic Pharisaism, are expressed in the fact that this Israelite publican was destined to write his Gospel first of all for Jewish Christians.

The peculiarity of this Évangelist is decidedly expressed in his Gospel. First, with regard to formal peculiarities, it is remarkable that the first Gospel should be the work of that very apostle who was practised in the art of writing.¹ But it is a characteristic of this Gospel which is increasingly recognised, that a careful grouping of events prevails throughout. The observation of this circumstance, namely, that arrangement is so very apparent in the discourses in chap. v.—vii., chap. x., chap. xiii., chap. xxiv. and xxv., induced, by an over-hasty process of association, the hypothesis that the original Gospel of Matthew consisted only of a collection of sayings. It may, however, be easily proved, that even those parts of this Gospel in which facts are narrated, are arranged according to the motives which evoked them. Thus, *e.g.*, the first manifestation of the Messianic miraculous power of Christ, is exhibited from the beginning of the eighth to the end of the ninth chaps.; and thus also are those great conflicts between Christ and His age, which preceded His persecution, depicted in chap. xi. and xii. These hints may suffice to direct attention to the true architectural fitting in of parts, exhibited by the whole Gospel; the carrying out of this remark must be reserved for our subsequent development of this Gospel. With the tendency of this Evangelist to

¹ Thus Mark was predisposed to write a Gospel by his ardent spirit of enterprise; Luke, by his education and habits of investigation; John, by that contemplative bias, which in his case far outweighed the external circumstances of life.

group his events, is closely connected the feeling which led him to exhibit in juxtaposition things which presented sharp contrasts. We have already remarked upon this style in our Evangelist. Thus, *e.g.*, in what striking antithesis do we find Herod and the new-born King of the Jews, and the teaching of Christ and the teaching of the Pharisees in the Sermon on the Mount! The whole Gospel, in fact, is full of contrasts. It is also peculiar to it to exhibit objects only in their bold outlines and characteristic features. When objects are to be portrayed in all their sublimity, it would but exert a disturbing influence to enrich them at the same time with graphic details. In such a case, the delineation of particulars must necessarily be kept under. The reason why Matthew did not descend into particulars, is explained by the fact, that it was the simple grandeur of the Gospel facts which filled his view.

His peculiarities of form, however, are but the expression of peculiarity of matter. He exhibits the Gospel in its historical relation, as the completion, the spiritual fruit of the christological growth in the Old Testament. It was his task to prove to his own nation that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of David, the Son of Abraham (chap. i. 1). But just because Christ was, in his eyes, the true and spiritual King of the Jews, and His kingdom the true theocratic kingdom of God, did Matthew from the very first give prominence to the great contrast between the spiritual Israel and the worldly and hardened Israel. Thence it was, that from the beginning new conflicts were ever arising, thence that we continually meet with fresh sufferings of the holy Heir of the ancient theocracy till His death upon the cross, new triumphs till the manifestation of His glory. The series of the Messiah's sufferings runs through the whole of this Gospel as its prevailing thought. Even in that overture to the whole, the genealogy, we detect the notes of this tragic theme; for Mary is represented as misunderstood by her betrothed, and in danger of being exposed, together with her child, to civil dishonour; the child is persecuted by the secular power, and doomed to death, while the prelude of His death is seen in the slaughter of the infants of Bethlehem. The preference of this Evangelist for exhibiting Christ in His theocratic sufferings, is manifested in several characteristic traits. Nevertheless he

also delights in everywhere displaying His triumphs. How characteristic is it, that it is Matthew who, in the history of Peter's wounding the high priest's servant, records the words of Jesus: 'Thinkest thou, that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He shall presently give Me more than twelve legions of angels?' Thus it is Matthew who, in recording this incident, is concerned for the dignity of the King; it is Mark who is careful for the character of his friend Peter, and omits the reproof; while Luke, the physician, is occupied with the case of the wounded man, and narrates the healing of his ear. It is also in accordance with this view of Christ, that Matthew, at the close of his Gospel, represents Him as the glorified Prince of heaven, to whom all power in heaven and earth is delivered.

It is clear, then, that we possess, in the Gospel of Matthew, a delineation of the life of Jesus, which presents it in all the distinctness and fulness of a peculiar view. This Evangelist makes our Lord known to us in all the certainty and depth of His relation to history. We here learn to estimate the relations of Christianity to Judaism, and to general historical traditions in the world. We even become acquainted with the double nature of these traditions, as they represent both the outpouring of the curse, and the outpouring of the blessing. Nowhere else is that golden thread which connects all history, the ever advancing though secret progress of mankind, so clearly displayed; and nowhere does the Eternal appear so pure and bright in history, so free from all contamination of the corrupt and perishable, nay, in sharpest and sublimest contrast to all the pretensions of mere dead statutes. Modern philosophy has not always been able to separate the laws of Jehovah from the decrees of the fathers in Israel. At one time, Christ is said to have been crucified according to the Mosaic law; at another, not to have felt bound to observe the Mosaic law in His own conduct. Philosophers might, in this respect at least, learn from Matthew that egg-shell dance of the thoughts, the distinction between laws and customs, since Matthew has drawn a portrait, in which the ever correct and quickest motion of a holy life between the most exact observance of law and the freest non-observance of customs is depicted. In this respect Christ is, according to Matthew's delineation, in an ideal sense the historic Christ; while, according to John, He is in an historic

sense the ideal Christ. From this Gospel we may learn to estimate parchments according to their value, the historic veins of the blessing of christological reference, and especially the indestructible thread running through the depths of the world's history. Here we become acquainted with the idea of the symphony and its accomplishment, with the prophetic relation between buds and blossoms on the tree of the world's history, between preludes and concluding chords in the history of Israel. But here also we discern the true freedom and glory of that ideal and consecrated life, matured on the tree of history, contrasted with the poor, naked, illegal appearance it presented to those who were prejudiced by the rusted and decayed traditions of history. None other displays, in features so speaking and forcible as Matthew, the nothingness of ungodly temporal or hierarchical power, in its enmity against a Christ sharing the poor man's lot. The manner in which he exhibits the suffering Son of David submitting to the sentence of death, amidst the misconception and delusion of His own nation, sheds, from that bright centre where the true sin-offering of the human race bleeds to death, a light upon all the tragic events and tragic poems of the world, in their christological and presentient allusions. He teaches us to receive Christ in the hungry, the thirsty, the strangers, the sick, the naked, the prisoners. But above this holy suffering, we here behold in all its glory the overruling providence of the retributing and assisting God. The kingdom of the Father's glory surrounds the scene of the historical reality ; it beams around, and breaks in at the decisive moment. The harmony between the tender centre of the world, the holy child, and the ardent circumference of the world, the all-ruling providence of God ; between that freest life, Christianity, and the eternal appointment, the counsel of God ; between the triumph of the kingdom of Christ, and the rule of the Almighty Father ; is here depicted in the clearest characters. Hence, this Gospel may be defined as that which casts a light upon the suffering Christ, and in Him on Christian suffering, and all the christological sufferings of the world, especially upon the tragic course of history, by special views and definite representations.

As Matthew sets forth the Redeemer in His relation to history, so does Mark exhibit Him in the reality of His power as the Son of God (chap. i. 1) ; as He, reposing on the fulness of

His Godhead power, manifests His life in an increasingly great, striking, and fervent agency, and spreads blessings around Him, the Lion of the tribe of Judah.

The special ray of Christ's glory which John Mark's peculiarity fitted him to exhibit in vivid touches from the fulness of Gospel truth, was the manner in which His deeds revealed the greatness of His person. According to Acts xii. 12, he was the son of a Christian woman named Mary, in whose house at Jerusalem the believers, or at least the principal among them, were wont to assemble. When Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles, he was already known and esteemed by the Christian Church, or Luke would not have introduced his mother to notice by naming her son. He was a Christian, and early devoted himself to the apostolic missionary life; on which account Paul and Barnabas took him with them on their return from Jerusalem to Antioch (Acts xii. 25). Thence he accompanied them, as their helper and minister, on their joint missionary journey (Acts xiii. 5): He travelled with them to Seleucia and Cyprus, and thence to Asia Minor. When they arrived, however, at Perga in Pamphylia, he parted from them and returned to Jerusalem (Acts xiii. 13), while they continued their journey to Pisidia. When they were about to repeat this journey from Antioch, for the purpose of strengthening the churches they had founded, John Mark was again there. Barnabas even proposed that he should again accompany them. 'But Paul thought not good to take him with them, who departed from them from Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work.' A strife now arose between them, and they separated from each other. Barnabas, taking Mark with him, sailed to Cyprus; and Paul, choosing Silas for his companion, passed through Syria and Cilicia (Acts xv. 37, etc.). This John Mark is undoubtedly the same whom we subsequently find again with Paul during the imprisonment of that apostle at Rome; whence it arises that he is introduced to us as one well known to the Christian Church of that time, and as nephew to Barnabas. Paul wrote concerning him, in his Epistle to the Colossians (chap. iv. 10): 'Aristarchus, my fellow-prisoner, saluteth you, and Marcus, sister's son to Barnabas (touching whom ye received commandments: if he come unto you, receive him).' In his second Epistle to Timothy,

he says (chap. iv. 11), 'Take Mark and bring him with thee: for he is profitable to me for the ministry.' In the Epistle to Philemon, Paul mentions him among his fellow-workers, and sends greetings from him (ver. 24). And the same Mark, at another time, sends greeting by Peter to the churches at home, from Babylon. 'The church that is at Babylon, elected together with you, saluteth you, and so doth Marcus my son: ' 1 Pet. v. 13. The Mark who could be thus so plainly designated as the friend and acquaintance of the Christians of Asia Minor or Palestine, and who besides stood on so intimate a footing with Peter, that that apostle could call him his son, could have been none other than the same frequently-mentioned John Mark. Sufficient notice of him has thus been handed down to us, even if we do not introduce the tradition, according to which he suffered martyrdom as Bishop of Alexandria.

The incident related by Mark himself, in his account of our Lord's Passion, of a young man who followed Jesus when He was arrested, and then escaped from the young men who laid hold on him, has frequently been regarded as a circumstance which the Evangelist relates concerning himself. It has indeed been said, that this is a merely groundless supposition. But without taking into account the fact, that the Apostle John also introduces himself into his Gospel without name, and in the same manner as Mark does the young man, we can scarcely fail to recognise in this small episode of the Passion, the identical John Mark of the Acts and Epistles. At the entrance of the troop into the city with their prisoner, when all the disciples had fled, 'there followed him a certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body' (Mark xiv. 15). This was undoubtedly a young man whom Mark had some reason for leaving unnamed; whom the excitement caused that night by the announcement that Jesus had been taken prisoner, had aroused and driven from his couch; and who already stood in a friendly relation to Him,—a young man who is soon ready, who casts a garment about him and hastens out; who is precipitate in action. This same youth, however, who is so prompt in exposing himself to danger, is just as prompt in flying from it, and again shows himself precipitate and full of anxious hurry: 'And the young men laid hold on him; and he left the linen cloth and fled from them naked.' We have here, as it were, a psycholo-

gical prelude to the first missionary journey of John Mark. He was ready to start, prepared for the journey: his ardent desire for missionary work had early brought him into the society of Paul. All went on well as long as they were sailing on the blue waters of the Mediterranean, as long as they stayed in the safe and polished land of Cyprus, and even while they sojourned on the coasts of Asia Minor. But when at length the mountain land of Asia Minor had to be traversed, he gave way—certainly for no reason which Paul could think sufficient—and returned, not to Antioch, but to his home at Jerusalem. Afterwards, however, he was again at Antioch, his fervid mind urging him back to the forsaken path. Barnabas was willing to take him again, and, as Olshausen justly remarks, knowing the good disposition of his beloved kinsman, he espoused his cause. Paul, however, rejected him, on account of his want of reflection, and still hesitating and unreliable enthusiasm. And therefore he again traversed with Barnabas the old and more convenient missionary route. But the Spirit of God was leading him, and he progressively and decidedly advanced from the paths of enthusiasm to those paths of Christian self-denial, upon which he at last laid down his life in the cause of his beloved Master. It is a precious testimony to his growth in humility and earnest faith, as well as to the apostolic benevolence of St Paul, that he was afterwards so closely connected with that apostle, and stood by him during his imprisonment in Rome. But though his individuality was thus progressively purified and sanctified, he could not but continue like himself in all its essential qualities; and hence we always meet with the same old ardour, more wont to kindle into a sudden blaze, than to burn steadily on. Now he is far westward with Paul at Rome, then far eastward with Peter in the region of Babylon. If we add to this the testimony of history, he is finally at Alexandria, and thus dwelt and did the work of an Evangelist in the great capitals of the three quarters of the world. We see in him an apostolic man who maintained a truly earnest faith in an easily excited mind, who was undoubtedly endowed with a powerful imagination and a high degree of enthusiasm; but whom a certain want of profundity of mind, and quiet strength of character, disposed to an external display of enthusiasm which perhaps rendered the strict consistency of Paul too powerful for him, and in-

clined him to the more congenial companionship of Peter. At all events, the above-mentioned features are clearly discernible in his transitions from one to another of the great missionary stations and renowned apostles.

All the characteristic features of this fervid and enthusiastic Evangelist appear in his work. With respect to the negative side of his character, we recognise a man who is quick, not too persevering, and indisposed to deep contemplation. His Gospel is short; it terminates abruptly; it exhibits no distinct basis of arrangement or division; it communicates but few of Christ's discourses, and those but briefly, and chiefly such as are of the most fervid kind,—disputes, reproofs, and His sayings concerning the last judgment. It is also elliptical in expression; *e.g.*, where the disciples are forbidden to put on two coats (chap. vi. 9); or where the Roman centurion concludes, from the cry of Jesus at his death: This was the Son of God (chap. xv. 39).

The lively vigour of this Evangelist is, however, displayed in a rich abundance of positive energy, and it is with this that we are now concerned. The constant excitement and enthusiasm of his view is expressed in the strength of his expressions; *e.g.*, in the accumulation of negatives, *οὐκ ἐτι οὐδεὶς*, as well as in his choice of unusual words, modes of expression, and constructions. It appears also in the rapid succession of his pictures; the word 'straightway' (*εὐθέως*) is his watchword. Vigour of this kind generally ramifies into the gifts of a vigorous and graphic imagination, a strong predilection for the concrete, and a consequently happy memory for details, connected with an excitable temperament, with its affectionate mode of expression. Hence it is Mark, with his graphic imagination, who tells us that Jesus was *with the wild beasts* in the wilderness; that the accursed fig-tree was *dried up from the roots*. Such finishing touches are entirely in keeping with truth; they are the fruit of independent and closer observation. This Evangelist also manifests his sense for objective detail, when he relates how Jesus, in His passage across the lake, was *in the hinder part of the ship, asleep upon a pillow*; when he remembers that the blind beggar at Jericho was called Bartimæus, the son of Timæus; and relates the beautiful parable (chap. iv. 26, etc.) in so striking a manner, or recalls the gradual process in the cure of the blind man (chap. viii. 22). His frequent use of diminutives specially testifies to

his affectionate manner of expression (*e.g.*, *θυγάτριον*, v. 23 ; *παιδίον*, v. 39 ; *κοράσιον*, v. 41 ; *κυνάρια*, vii. 27 ; *ἰχθύδια*, viii. 7). It is in accordance with this same ardent cordiality, that we find in this Gospel frequent transitions to foreign expressions, especially a number of Latin words (*δηνάριον*, *κεντυρίων*, etc.).¹ The second Gospel, then, is that of an enthusiastic view, a portraiture of the Son of God in His glorious fulfilment of His office, in the greatness of His operations. The history of Christ is made to pass before us in a rapid succession of great pictures, drawn from the life. He fulfils His beneficent mission in great working days, with sublime effort, and amidst great press of work ; a constant storm of forces proceeds from Him. Hence He is also ever encompassed by crowds, especially of the needy, so that often He has neither room to stand nor time to eat ; nay, His laborious love at one time kindles into such ardent activity, and produces such an excitement among the surrounding multitudes, that His friends wish to withdraw Him from the crowd, uttering those words of anxiety : ‘ He is beside Himself ’ (chap. iii. 21). He makes the deepest impression upon the people ; they wonder, they are beyond measure astonished, they are amazed, when He appears, and manifests His love and power. And His acts were in accordance with such an influence, ‘ for He had healed many ; insomuch that they pressed upon Him for to touch Him, as many as had plagues.’ Wherever His arrival was heard of, they brought unto Him all that were sick in the neighbourhood, and exposed them on their litters in the streets, with the request that they might touch but the hem of His garment ; ‘ and as many as touched Him were made whole.’ Even the mere appearance of Christ struck the multitude, so that they trembled with reverence and joy (chap. ix. 15). His acts are also a continual victory over inimical powers. This Gospel is far less pervaded than the first by anticipations of death. Of the sayings of Jesus on the cross, Mark has preserved only the exclamation : ‘ My God, My God, why hast Thou for-

¹ On the peculiarities of Mark, compare Credner, *Einleitung* 102 ; Hitzig, *Ueber J. Markus u. s. Schriften* 119 ; Ebrard, *Gospel History* 78. [Davidson (i. 152) follows Credner’s arrangement, and exhibits in detail Mark’s peculiarities both of diction and style. Westcott also (p. 344) gives an independent account of the same, though he has ‘ derived great help from Credner.’—ED.]

saken Me?' Just the lion-like cry of sorrow. In the same manner, he relates the history of the resurrection chiefly in its most agitating effects.¹ The disciples, in their sorrow, will believe no announcement of His resurrection: neither that of Mary Magdalene, nor of the two disciples who had seen Him in the way. As soon, however, as Christ appears among them, and reproves their unbelief, their disposition is entirely changed: they are now in a condition to receive the commission to preach the Gospel to every creature. An influx of Christ's power accompanies His messengers, and confirms their words, after His resurrection and ascension. Thus does Mark conclude his Gospel in complete conformity with his own view; for it was in those miraculous healing influences of the power of the Son of God, which agitate and change the world, that the life of Christ had been contemplated by him. And in this view he is unique; the Gospel which he announces, is the Gospel of those vital powers of Christ which pervade the world. He is ever representing Christ as an ever-active, divine-human energy. The manner in which He moved the minds of the people to every pitch of emotion, to horror, fear, trust, hope, delight, rapture, and poured forth His reproving, healing, and sanctifying power upon these different frames of mind, must be learnt from Mark. The celerity with which Christ accomplished a work so infinitely great; the enthusiastically arduous daily labour by which He filled the world with the power of His name; the ardent and persevering courage with which He burst through the sorrows of the world, and through the grave, and raised Himself to the throne of His glory; are portrayed in this specifically distinct conception of His life as characteristics of the Divine Hero, carrying out His work of salvation in swift and conquering operations. This mighty activity is at the same time a symbol, representing all vigorous, divine works, all the agitating, awakening, animating ministrations of hearts filled with God, all the victories of christological deeds, every lion-like effort, every lion-like roar, every lion-like victory of faith on earth, and in general every ray of victorious power proceeding from the throne of the Son of God.

In the first Gospel we behold the Redeemer, as the promised

¹ Ver. 14 of chap. xvi. so entirely coincides with ver. 8, that the genuineness of the concluding passage might be inferred therefrom. All is entirely in the spirit of Mark.

Son of David, entering upon His kingdom by the path of suffering; in the second He appears before us, as the infinitely powerful Son of God, obtaining a victory over the world amid floods and storms of conquering power, and therefore in the way of divine and rejoicing activity. But we have yet to know Him as seeing and seeking in the Israelites the whole human race; and, though limited as to His earthly surroundings by the Israelitish nation, as delivering and blessing the world. The Evangelist Luke was called upon both to comprehend and exhibit the Gospel history on that side which reflected the divine Son of man.

The first notice of Luke in the New Testament appears in his second work, the Acts of the Apostles, which informs us in the most unassuming manner, that at Troas he first shared in the Apostle Paul's missionary journey (Acts xvi. 10 and 11). 'Loosing from Troas, we came with a straight course to Samothracia,'¹ are the words in which he communicates the fact of his entrance into the apostle's company. We then lose him again from the society of Paul and Silas at Philippi (Acts xvi. 17, etc.), where the two latter were cast into prison on account of the cure by Paul of a young woman who was a soothsayer. When they were afterwards liberated, and departed thence, Luke remained, as it appears, at Philippi. When Paul returned to Philippi, Luke again joined him, and sailed with him from Philippi to Troas on their way to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 6). In Jerusalem also we find them together; Luke going with Paul into the assembly of the apostles (Acts xxi. 18). He was, however, once more separated from him by the arrest of Paul, which was effected by the Jewish Zealots (Acts xxi. 27). After Paul had been sent to Cæsarea, and while he was detained there in milder but tedious imprisonment, Luke seems to have been again in connection with him. For it is said, that the governor Felix 'commanded a centurion to keep Paul, and to let him have liberty, and that he should forbid none of his acquaintance to minister or come unto him' (Acts xxiv. 23). At least the command, in consequence of which Paul travelled to Italy, was also a decision concerning him, and for him. 'It was determined that

¹ That both in this passage and chap. xx. it is not Timothy who is the narrator, as some have supposed, is evident, as has been rightly remarked, from a comparison of vers. 4, 5, and 6 of chap. xx. Comp. Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit der ev. Gesch.* p. 136.

we should sail into Italy,' says he (Acts xxvii. 1). He consequently accompanied Paul on this voyage, and came with him to Rome (Acts xxviii. 14). At Rome Luke was, at least for some length of time, the helper of the apostle. It was hence that Paul wrote in his second Epistle to Timothy, 'Only Luke is with me;' and in his Epistle to Philemon, and in that to the Colossians, also written from this city, Luke is included among those who send greetings. It is from the latter Epistle that we learn that Luke was a physician, and that he was beloved by the apostle: 'Luke, the beloved physician, and Demas greet you' (Col. iv. 14); and also that he was a Gentile, since, after it is said (chap. iv. 10 and 11), 'Aristarchus, my fellow-prisoner, saluteth you, and Marcus, etc., and Jesus which is called Justus, *who are of the circumcision*,' there follow the names of others, who are therefore not of the circumcision, and it is among the latter that the name of Luke is found.

If we now turn to the account of Epiphanius, that Luke was one of the seventy disciples, and to the information of Theophylact, that he was designated by some as one of the seventy disciples, and indeed as the one who, with Cleopas, met with the risen Saviour, these traditionary accounts, considered alone, may be purely hypothetical. This is, however, the place to state what may be said in favour of the hypothesis. And, first, we may remark, that Luke alone relates the account of the journey to Emmaus, and that in a very graphic manner; making the presumption, that he was himself an eye-witness of what he narrates, a very probable one. It is especially striking, that he should leave the name of one of these disciples unmentioned; and when this practice is compared with that of John, this circumstance seems to point to the fact, that the author was speaking of himself. If this were the case, we should then have to conclude that Luke, as a Hellenist, introduced to the Messiah through those who revered Him (perhaps one of the Greeks mentioned John xii. 20), had come with joyful hope to keep the feast at Jerusalem, and had been most deeply agitated by the unexpected turn which matters had now taken. Such a conclusion would explain the expressions, 'Art thou the only stranger in Jerusalem who hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days?' (chap. xxiv. 18); and, 'we trusted that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel,' ver. 21. Besides,

it is only on this supposition that the expressions *περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων*¹ ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων, and οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γινόμενοι τοῦ λόγου (chap. i. 1, 2), are perfectly clear. Luke thereby declares that he had not been present at the earlier events of the Gospel history, though he had at the later—they had taken place while he already belonged to the sacred circle ('among us'). He also had then become an eye-witness and minister of the Gospel, but this did not suffice to make him a narrator of the whole Gospel; for such a purpose, he must also avail himself of the communications of those who had from the beginning (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς emphatic by position, expressing the contrast) occupied such a position. Finally, the before-mentioned expression of Papias should be well considered in connection with these circumstances. He had a witness who, together with John, the apostolic presbyter, represented that oral tradition which he places in contradistinction to the writings of Matthew and Mark. When he reduces his Latin name *Lukanus*, *Lucilius*, or *Luke*, to its probably earlier form *Aristion*, this entirely corresponds with his palæological feeling, as does also the circumstance that he calls the apostles, presbyters.² (Comp. p. 169 and 183.)

Luke was then a Hellenist. The whole history of his life requires us to attribute to him a certain proportion of the Hellenistic education of his age. He was a physician, living in a seaport town. In such a position, although the calling and position of physicians are not to be judged of according to present circumstances, it was necessary that he should satisfy the requirements of the time with respect to a higher degree of cultivation, nor could he fail to experience the intellectual influences and excitements of the age. If, as Eusebius informs us,

¹ On the meaning of the word *πληροφορεῖσθαι*, comp. Gfrörer, *Die h. Sage*, p. 39. 'Where *πληροφορεῖσθαι* has the signification of "to be certainly convinced," it is used *medialiter*; the subject to which the verb then relates, is always a person, an intelligent being, never a thing. Applied to things, its first meaning is "to complete, to make whole:" compare the use of the word 2 Tim. iv. 5.'

² It may be justly asked, Why *Aristion*, a man honoured by Papias as a disciple of the Lord, and named by him in connection with John the presbyter, was not known and celebrated in the apostolic Church? This difficulty can only be obviated by the supposition, that *Aristion* was known to the Church by the name of *Luke*.

he was born at Antioch in Syria, he must have been influenced, even in his native city, by the secular learning of his age. In any case, as a Hellenistic Monotheist and proselyte, he had certainly attained that degree of cultivation in which reflection on spiritual relations is called into existence. In his medical career, this reflection would soon develope itself into an investigation of physical, anthropological, and psychological relations. It must also be granted that, in the case of Luke, the force of an important personality was added to these endowments. Even if his connection with Theophilus, who, as we infer from the preface to St Luke's Gospel, was a man of some importance, is not taken into account, yet his constant association with Paul is well calculated to place his personality in the most favourable light. Perhaps it was owing to the respectability of his position and appearance that the politic and interested magistracy of Philippi left him unassailed, when Paul and Silas were thrown into prison, and that he was also left at liberty at Jerusalem, when Paul was arrested there. If Luke had, in these cases, failed in fidelity, that apostle would scarcely have again accepted him as his companion, nor would he have been subsequently found among the followers of a man so constantly threatened. If he were a man who acted rashly and inconsiderately, how did it happen that he suffered so much less than the apostle whom he accompanied, that his career is entirely lost sight of beside the more persecuted one of St Paul? The Acts of the Apostles displays his talent for research and delineation.¹ Endowed with these gifts, firm, yet submissive and gentle, cultivated and acquainted with the world, he became an assistant of the apostles. We will not insist that he passed some part of his life in intercourse with the Lord. At all events, as an inquiring Greek who, passing through the middle territory of Jewish Monotheism, was seeking the knowledge of salvation, he attained to faith in the Gospel in another manner than the pious Israelites. It was not so much the fulfilment of the Old Testament types and prophecies, as the fulfilment of his own yearnings after the manifestation of the Godhead in flesh, and especially of his anticipations of the fairest of the children

¹ On the learned acquaintance of Luke with the events of his times, comp. Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte*, pp. 136 ff., and Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, p. 254.

of men, the actual ideal Man, the true Physician and Friend of humanity, which made him recognise in Christ, the Saviour of the nations. The moral nature of Christianity, its holy humanity, the fulness and universality of its love for man, must have made the deepest impression upon a Hellenistic believer like Luke. But when he subsequently lived in intercourse with Paul, this recognition of a universalism in Christianity, which looks upon all men alike, would grow to a recognition of the grace which, within the sphere of this universalism, turns first of all to those whom the world contemns, that it may restore the balance of eternal righteousness, which hath 'chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and the weak things of the world, to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are' (1 Cor. i. 27, 28).

Thus endowed and prepared, Luke was called upon to write the third Gospel. It is *his* view of the Gospel history. We find his whole self in his work. With respect to its form, it is evident, particularly from its chronological inaccuracies, that he was not personally present at all the events of Christ's life, especially the earlier ones. We recognise his habit of research in the manner in which he supports his statements by a collection of trustworthy memoirs, often letting these speak in their own words, as shown by the frequent concluding formulæ with which his work is interspersed,¹ and by the variety of diction employed. Especially does the pure Greek in which the introduction is written, when contrasted with the Hebraistic style of the Gospel, together with its research into Gospel history, testify to the fact that Luke, as an Evangelist, adopted the very language of the evangelical traditions. Schleiermacher, in his above-mentioned work, not only designates Luke a good collector and arranger, but specially praises him for having *almost exclusively* accepted *genuine and good passages* (p. 302). 'This,' says he, 'is certainly not the work of accident,

¹ Such concluding forms are found by Schleiermacher, chap. i. 80, ii. 18, 40, 52, chap. iv. 15, 44. In some, the assumption, which sees concluding forms in generalities of the kind adduced, may deceive; they should nevertheless be duly estimated in the sense in which this critic explains them, as a characteristic trait pervading this whole Gospel.

but the result of an investigation undertaken for a definite purpose, and of well-considered choice.' Luke's acute spirit of inquiry did not, however, merely collect an excellent selection of Gospel incidents peculiar to himself, but also many most valuable notices, which either complete, explain, or even correct the narratives of the other Evangelists. It is he alone who gives the reasons for the birth of Jesus at Jerusalem, the history of John the Baptist, the appearance of Moses and Elias on the Mount of Transfiguration (chap. ix. 31), the instruction of the disciples in the Lord's prayer, the circumstance that Peter was armed with a sword at Gethsemane (chap. xxii. 38), and many other circumstances and occurrences in the Gospel narrative. His statements are in many respects more accurate than those of Matthew and Mark. He clearly distinguishes, for instance, in the prophecy of Christ concerning the last things, between the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world. According to him, the saying of Christ concerning the heavenly signs runs thus: There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; according to Matthew and Mark, The stars will fall from heaven. It is he who has preserved the fact of the great difference between the impenitent and the penitent thief, and informed us of the happy end of the latter; while Matthew summarily relates the blasphemy of those who were crucified with Jesus. He says of the disciples, with a psychological appreciation of their state of mind, *They believed not for joy* (chap. xxiv. 41); while Mark represents them as upbraided by the Lord for their hardness of heart, which nevertheless is equally correct, since they were not yet fully sanctified (Mark xvi. 14). The reflections with which the Gospel of Luke is interspersed, display also the superior education of its composer. Among these may be reckoned, *e.g.*, the remarks on the miraculous agency of Christ: 'The power of the Lord was present to heal them;' 'there went virtue out of Him, and healed them all' (chap. v. 17 and vi. 19); also the account of the occasion of the transfiguration: *And as He prayed, the fashion of His countenance was altered.* Many allusions in this Gospel seem, either by their insertion or position, to manifest the inclination of its author to psychological reflections. Did he perhaps intend to point out, even in the holy and blessed frame of the mother of Jesus, her fitness for bringing forth the holy Son of

man? If this question is left undecided, it is certain that he has inserted in the narrative he gives concerning Jesus at His twelfth year, a reflection on the wondrous development of His mind. 'Jesus,' says he, 'increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.' It seems also not the result of accident, that in the passage chap. ix. 54-62, the religious and moral phenomena presented by four different temperaments are placed in juxtaposition, while it is shown how Christ dealt with and healed each; viz., the angry zeal of the sons of thunder, the sanguine enthusiasm of a believing scribe, the melancholy home-sickness of a mourner, and the phlegmatic delay of a sluggish disciple. This juxtaposition is peculiar to Luke. The important notice of the disposition of the disciples, after Jesus had announced to them His approaching sufferings, is given by Luke alone, and that with such extraordinary emphasis, as must either be attributed to the most thoughtful reflection, or the most thoughtless tautology. It is said, viz., chap. xviii. 34, '*They understood none of these things; and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the things which were spoken.*' Perhaps this might be briefly summed up in the words, they *would not* and *could not* understand; that is, first, they would not take it to heart; therefore, secondly, the whole thing remained an enigma to them; and hence, thirdly, what was simple was incomprehensible. Undoubtedly Luke, accustomed as he was to act on motives, lays so strong a foundation, because he had afterwards to build upon it the strange phenomenon, that they did not believe the resurrection though it had been previously announced to them. In the remark also made by Luke, after relating how Pilate sent his prisoner to Herod for judgment, that the same day Herod and Pilate were made friends, may be discerned, as it seems to us, a psychological reflection, and even the refined irony of a Christian acquaintance with human nature. The preservation too of that glorious account of how the Lord turned and looked upon Peter after his third denial, testifies to the same psychological acuteness for the wonders of the Light of the World. These various traces of the psychologist in this Gospel, naturally lead us upon those of the physician. To discover then the physician in this work, we need by no means go so far as to seek for technical medical terms. We have already pointed out some of the most striking

marks of this kind. All the four Evangelists, for instance, relate the rashness with which Peter cut off the ear of the high priest's servant. Matthew, Mark, and John, however, seem, in the press of this mysterious moment, to forget this slight inconvenience. Jesus, the Saviour, however, though in so terrible a situation, could not leave the wound of the sufferer uncared for; and a report of His interposition being extant, Luke, the physician, could not pass it by, as the others had done. The physician could not but manifest himself in a characteristic report, and he does it in the words: 'Jesus touched his ear and healed him.' It is likewise Luke alone who tells us of the sweat which fell, 'as it were great drops of blood,' from Jesus in Gethsemane.

When we contemplate the mental peculiarity which meets us in Luke's Gospel, it is evident that it is its manifestations of divine pity and mercy which form in his view the key-note of the Gospel history. Even his sense for what was humane and rational in argument points to this; *e.g.*, in chap. xiii. 15, etc.: 'Doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath-day?' Christ everywhere appears to this Evangelist in the aspect of the benevolent Redeemer, tenderly sympathizing with the sorrows of men, and consoling them with the gracious words which proceeded out of His mouth. Very characteristically does he prolong His genealogy beyond Abraham to Adam; His descent is from man. The first of His discourses communicated in this Gospel is that to His poor countrymen at Nazareth, and is founded on a consolatory passage in the Old Testament (Luke iv. 17). How tenderly does He address to the widow of Nain the unspeakably touching words, Weep not! while He Himself weeps over Jerusalem, looks back with melancholy sympathy upon the daughters of Jerusalem who were following Him on His way to death, and prays for His enemies while hanging in agony on the cross. This same spirit of divine pity is expressed also in the relation of His Gospel to man, as exhibited in a concentrated form in the view taken of it by this Evangelist. The solitary and

childless priestly pair are first visited, and highly favoured, and then, in the highest degree, the poor virgin of Nazareth. The Holy Child is born into the world; but poor shepherds are the first to rejoice at this event, which brightens the last days of the aged Simeon and the solitary Anna. It was through a miraculous benefit that Simon Peter was astonished and first made entirely Christ's disciple. We soon after find Jesus in the presence of the anxious centurion of Capernaum; even the elders of the Jews intercede for him. How remarkable is the selection of a resurrection narrative in Luke: it concerns the only son of a widow! This kind of selection goes through the whole Gospel. Even the appearance of holy women among the followers of Jesus, was a circumstance which would catch the eye of this benevolent Evangelist. It was quite in Luke's nature to preserve Mary's hymn of praise, in which the Lord is extolled as 'He who putteth down the mighty from their seats, and exalteth them of low degree; who filleth the hungry with good things, and sendeth the rich empty away.' And if Luke, in his version of the Sermon on the Mount, pronounces the blessedness of the poor, the hungry, the mourner, as such, though with special notice, in the case of the hated, that it is for the Son of man's sake that they have incurred this hatred (vi. 22), this is so far from being a mark of that Jewish Ebionitism which declared the poor Jews to be blessed above the rich Gentiles, that it seems, on the contrary, impossible to misunderstand here a direct contrast to that Ebionitism, if there be but capacity to receive the notion, that the Gospel does, in fact, seek out its subjects first of all among the oppressed and afflicted. This applies also to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. But it is no weak and cowardly pity, which abandons the fallen, that is exhibited in this Gospel, but the divinely strong pity of eternal mercy. Luke alone relates the pardon of the 'woman which was a sinner,' the conversion of Zaccheus, and the penitence of the crucified thief; he alone has given us the parables of the lost sheep and the lost piece of money, and that most glorious of all parables, the prodigal son. The contrast between the spirit of Christ and the spirit of Pharisaism, is expressed with the strongest emphasis by this Evangelist. The history of the ten lepers, among whom there was but one grateful, and he a Samaritan—the narrative of the good

Samaritan—and the parable of the Pharisee and publican, taken together, express this contrast with most inculcating effect. Luke's Gospel is to its very close characteristic, for the Saviour departs from His disciples while He is blessing them.

The world and the Church needed this chosen instrument to collect and preserve the brightest, loveliest rays of Christ's glory, to sound abroad the most peculiar tone of His divinely humane heart, the tenderest and mightiest notes of His tender mercy. Of all the cherubic symbols, it is the image of the man which is the most applicable to Luke. In his Gospel it is declared that the grace of God cares for, nay, is poured forth upon the poor, the lowly, the mean, the overlooked, the despised, the forsaken in the world. Compassion appears in all its freeness, nay, in all its loving, joyful pride, in opposition to the prejudices of Pharisaism, of fanaticism, of ecclesiasticism stiffened into heartlessness, and of absolute pietism relying on its privileges. This grace appears also in its more general form, as love; and in its genial nature as rejoicing, tender loving-kindness, under a thousand aspects. It is incarnated, however, in the Son of man, as holy, glorious humanity, of one nature and agency with Him, manifesting itself through Him, His most peculiar honour. Through Him it is related with all christological life in the world. Whatever of love and kindness passes from heart to heart, every exhibition of faithfulness, help, or good-will, offered in the spirit of true benevolence or pity, proclaims the breathing of that gentle, divine-human spirit, whose fulness flows forth from Christ upon the world. This christological trait is the more precious to the Lord, the more it is outwardly obscured by hereditary heterodoxy, heathen tradition, and similar ancient husks of the old offence. The good Samaritan is one after His own heart, who died on Golgotha under the ban of excommunication, and upon that terrible scene of shame and desolation effected the salvation of the world. Thus does the third Gospel exhibit, together with the abundance and power of the grace and human love of Christ, a world of kindred emotions and influences, proceeding from and returning to Him.

If, then, we regard the Gospel history as the climax and centre of all life, and then remember that all life proceeds from the Spirit, and is, in its deepest foundations, entirely ideal ;

it is at the same time evident that the relation of the Gospel history to the ideal must be made clear. Since we find, then, that the three first Gospels, notwithstanding the richness of their contents, do not in a specific and definite manner satisfy this necessity, it is evident that we need a fourth Gospel to complete the announcements of the former, by an exhibition of the relation between the Gospel history and the idea.

Both in Christ Himself and in His life, this tone of ideality, the lyric and recognised reference of His life to all that is ideal in the world, could not but resound in fullest purity. This is involved in the firmly established notion of His personality; and isolated expressions of this reference are found even in the synoptists. But are we to conclude that Christ could find no instrument capable of the most definite apprehension of this sacred basis, this deepest and sublimest side of His whole manifestation? Are we to suppose that the most refined, the deepest, the sublimest view of His life, is the production of some idealistic apocryphal author, not included within the apostolic circle? In this case Christ would not have fully manifested Himself, or rather, he who had thus imperfectly manifested himself could not be the perfect Christ. No idealist, with his surplus of philosophical refinement, was needed to supply what was lacking to Him. And what idealist of the Platonic or Philonic school could have done this?¹ The idealistic reasoner of the second century is placed too high, when the production of St John's Gospel is ascribed to him. The ideal Son of man is placed too low, when the consciousness of His relation to the ideal, and the revelation of this consciousness by means of an appropriate and elect instrument, is denied to Him.

It was the Apostle John who was called to the apprehension of this tranquil ideal depth of the life of Jesus. An inspired enthusiastic thirsting after light seems to have been the chief feature of his character. He was the son of Zebedee, a Galilean fisherman on the Lake of Gennesaret, and brother of James the Great. His father seems to have willingly devoted his worldly

¹ In the Gospel of John, and in his first Epistle, the spirituality of all creative life is expressed in so pregnant a manner, that the opposers of the authenticity of the Gospel may be confidently challenged to point out whence the light of this knowledge could have originated, except from the breast of Jesus, by means of a most germane and elect instrument.

superfluity to higher purposes (Mark xv. 40, 41); his mother Salome was a pious, courageous, aspiring woman (Matt. xx. 20). It was probably from her that John inherited his noble mental tendencies. We early find him among the disciples of the Baptist, and he was undoubtedly one of the first disciples of Jesus (John i. 35 comp. Matt. iv. 21, etc.). John, together with his brother James, and Peter, were gradually admitted into a peculiarly intimate relation with the Lord (Matt. xvi. 17). These three disciples were the very elect of the elect.¹ We sometimes see him associated with Peter, especially in the mission to prepare the Passover (Luke xxii. 8). We subsequently find this distinguished position of John in connection with Peter, appearing as permanent in the Acts. In this book he everywhere appears, with Peter alone, at the head of the apostolic band; he therefore and Peter were decidedly acknowledged as the most gifted, most blessed, and most important pillars of the Church,—an acknowledgment which the Lord's treatment of them would seem to have sanctioned. With reference, however, to Peter, Jesus had in some respects given John the precedence, and in others postponed him to that apostle. In personal relation to Christ, he was the first, the friend of Jesus, who lay on His breast, to whom the Lord committed the care of His mother—whom in this respect He put in His own position (John xiii. 23, xix. 26, 27, xxi. 7, 20–25). But in his vocation to found and guide the Church of Christ, Peter was preferred to him, as well as to the other apostles (Matt. xvi. 18, 19; Luke xxii. 31; John xxi. 15). This appointment of Christ formed no legal privilege; it only made the actual natural relations in which the two apostles stood to each other and to Him clear to the Church, and obtained for them the recognition of the community. Hence these relations are seen to exist also in the Acts of the Apostles. Peter everywhere appears in heroic greatness of deed; John walks in mysterious silence near the mighty pioneer-apostle. He must consequently, as far as force of natural character is concerned, be esteemed as far less important than Peter, if the perfectly equal respect they received did not lead us to infer the actual equilibrium of these personalities. We must then seek the distinctive gifts of John in those less conspicuous qualities of

¹ [So Clem. Alex. *Quis Dives Salv.* c. 36: τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι.—ED.]

heart and mind which are far removed from this prominent activity, and expect to find him as far superior to Peter in his powers of mental contemplation, as Peter is to him in powers of energetic action. This expectation is confirmed, as soon as we compare the first Epistle of John with the first Epistle of Peter. The first Epistle of John forms a homogeneous appendix to the fourth Gospel.¹ In it are displayed that disposition which rises to lyric fervour, that penetration which descends into the abysses of speculative contemplation, united with that deep strong ardour, bursting forth at intervals, which is peculiar to such a mind, and which here appears ennobled by the holy acuteness of a sublime purity. These separate features, however, when jointly contemplated, bear the impress of sublime, childlike simplicity, and are encompassed by a halo of lonely solemnity. The negative side of this said subjective disposition appears in the circumstance, that here, as everywhere, John brings forward but few historical references; in his writings the actual is merged and explained in the contemplative. Its positive side is displayed in the powerful apprehension of all worldly relations; *e.g.*, in the words, 'Children it is the last time;' while the poetic flights of the fervour which pervades all his expressions, is often prominent, as perhaps in the passage where he so solemnly addresses the fathers, the young men, and the children (1 John ii. 13). His enlightened penetration is shown, when he says of God, He is light, and in Him is no darkness; of Christ, The Life was manifested; of Christians, Ye have an anointing, and know all things; while the product of the subtlest speculative tendency is seen when, *e.g.*, he defines sin as the transgression of the law. Yet he is no philosophic or poetic idealist; his mind has a truly practical turn. This is seen even in his ardent zeal; as, *e.g.*, when he says, He that doeth sin is of the devil. This ardour sometimes kindles into sublimest purity. When he says, Whosoever hateth his brother, is a murderer, we are reading the very soul of a Christian man, to whom the world of thought has almost become the world of reality. But when it is said, Little children, abide in Him, we recognise the tone of his own noble simplicity; and in the words, This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith, is expressed the silent triumph of the man, who, by his unexcitable, almost leisurely seeming solemnity, has left

¹ Ebrard's *Gospel History*, p. 119.

the world certainly as important an apostolic blessing as any of his fellow-apostles have done in their more stirring performances. In the first Epistle of Peter, we recognise an apostle of an entirely opposite character from John, though one with him in Christian spirit. We find here the *aspiring* spirit, contemplating with peculiar delight the Christian hope, the incorruptible inheritance, and rejoicing with joy unspeakable, and full of glory, in the assurance of the Lord's return; the *preaching* spirit, encouraging, exhorting, consoling, and even declaring of the Lord Jesus, that He Himself preached to the spirits in prison; the dauntless *believing* spirit, looking upon himself and his fellow-Christians as a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, to show forth the praises of Christ; the *ordering* and *arranging* spirit, giving special exhortations, now to Christians in general, now to servants, to women, to men, to elders, to young Christians; the *animated* spirit, dealing in concrete views, loving to speak in figures, parables, and examples,—*e.g.*, of the gold purified by the fire, of the sincere milk of the word, of the precious corner-stone, of the typical obedience of Sarah; the *valiant* and *warlike* spirit, looking upon the adversary the devil as a roaring lion; finally, the spirit *purified by suffering*, who would stop the mouth of adversaries not with evil, but with well-doing;—in a word, we find everywhere that it is the converted Peter who is speaking to us.

His second Epistle also testifies to the same relation of the two apostles to each other, and to the Lord, by still exhibiting the decided and great contrast of their respective peculiarities. When these two disciples first heard from the pious women the confused report of the Lord's resurrection, they both ran to the sepulchre. John ran the more quickly; the impulse of his soul was more fervid, his enthusiasm was more soaring, more angel-like. Arrived at the grave, however, either reverence, or deep anxiety, or fearful anticipation suddenly restrained him. The prompt resolution of Peter, however, here gave him the precedence, and he went first into the grave. After the resurrection, we find the disciples, during the long interval of forty days, again on the Sea of Galilee; and again they pass the night upon the water, occupied in fishing. In the twilight of the morning, they see a mysterious personage standing on the shore. John is the first to recognise Him; the eagle glance of his mind seems

to extend even to his bodily eye, and he says, 'It is the Lord!' At the word of the *discriminative* apostle, the *energetic* apostle plunges into the water. It is Peter who swims to meet Jesus. In the high priest's palace, which he entered together with Peter, John maintained his exalted and silent individuality before the obtrusiveness of rude accusers, while Peter was driven first to make himself conspicuous, and then to deny his Master. Hence also, he passed as it were in heavenly concealment through the tribulations of the early Church, while the other great apostles were baptized with a baptism of blood, one after another. Hence, while the other apostles were agitating the great capitals of the then known world by the preaching of the Gospel, John died in peace as Bishop of Ephesus, one of the churches founded by Paul. And hence, finally, Peter was the rock upon which the Church of Christ was built at its commencement; it was his agency which pervaded the apostolic Church, and gave to it that energetic tendency to go forth into all the world, in the power of that Spirit from above which was bestowed upon him, while the contemplative tendency, the tendency of John, could not but retire into the background. But when the enlightenment of the Church, its perfection in inner life and spirituality, was to be promoted; when the sign of the Son of man was to dart forth like lightning, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same; the agency of John might well be the most conspicuous, and perhaps it may be reserved to the spirit of St John, the sublime son of thunder, the dazzling lightning, the purifying storm, to be that influence under whose light and warmth the Church is to be adorned as a bride for the coming Bridegroom.¹

As is the disciple, so is his Gospel. We will not any further refer to the various judgments that have been pronounced upon this much prized and much despised composition. They stand in more glaring contrast to each other than opinions concerning any of the other Gospels. It is from the hand of an angel, says one.² A phantom-like production! says another. On one side, it is said to be the heart of Christ;³ on another, it is called

¹ We can here only hint at the fact, that a like spirit is very clearly manifested in the Apocalypse, or, at the converse, that the Apocalypse points to a similar one.

² Herder.

³ It is so called by Ernesti.

mystically confused and *lengthened out*. Certainly John had to bear the cross in his own person, and he has ever had to bear it in his Gospel during its propagation through the world. Yet the unpopular Evangelist was happy, in the midst of all misconception, in the reality of his view of the Lord's glory; and spirits akin to his have ever been so, in spite of their isolation in the world.¹

The fourth Gospel bears the most distinct impress of the above-named characteristics of John. We find in it a profound insight which seizes the historical only in its most pregnant incidents, and contemplates in these, on one side, the whole fulness of the actual, on the other, the whole depth of the ideal. John the Baptist here represents the whole series of pre-Christian Old Testament prophets, through whose instrumentality christological light dawned upon the world; while Peter and John represent the continued prevalence of this light in the world after Christ's return to the Father. In a few chief incidents, the Evangelist shows us, first, how the light and life, after its appearance, attracted the receptive; and then how the unreceptive turned away from it; then, next, how the contrast between light and darkness was exhibited in more developed form; and, finally, how the signs of the victory which is destined to annihilate the darkness appeared. Thus the history which the Evangelist relates, is thoroughly penetrated by the ideality of his view of the world. The spiritual penetration of his view of Christ appears also in the freshness of his world of thought. As his facts are thoughts, so are his thoughts life. According to his mode of expression, the knowledge of eternal life and the true historic view of Christ is the knowledge of the Father. This inwardness often bears in his Gospel the lovely blossom of a lyric fervour, especially in the farewell discourses, where wave upon wave of inspired, sacred, evangelical feeling appear in a rich succession, which obtuseness of mind has more than once most miserably misconceived. The profundity of the Evangelist has laid down in this Gospel principles of the deepest and purest speculation, principles whose whole depth, when contrasted with the efforts hitherto made by philosophy, stand like the Jungfrau peak among the Alps. And what a wonderful polar relation to that eagle glance, which loses itself in the sunny heights of truth, is borne by that swift, lightning-like, blasting, holy indignation, where-

¹ *E.g.* Heinrich Suso.

with the Evangelist sees the condemning light of the Gospel fall upon the world, or upon 'the Jews,' the worldly spirits of Israel. He even assumes an appearance of contradiction to designate that desperate hatred of the light in the strongest terms. 'His own received Him not. But as many as received Him,' etc. 'This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light.' 'Ye seek Me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves.' 'Why do ye not understand My speech?—Ye are of your father the devil.' How forcible is the reproof: 'Because I tell you the truth, ye believe Me not!' And in the midst of all this fervid severity, we still recognise the constant prevalence of that quiet and simple spirit, whose sacred repose and sabbatic peace are forcibly contrasted with the busy restlessness of its opponents, and which is ever a characteristic of the Evangelists through every line of the Gospels. How characteristic is the scene at Jacob's well, when Christ, so opportunely resting at the well, discloses to a Samaritan woman, with so much freedom, the marvels of truth! The manner, too, in which Christ says to His disciples, at the close of the fourteenth chapter, 'Arise, let us go hence,' and then remains with His disciples, sunk in the long and continuous reflections which fill three chapters, without changing the place, is also singularly striking in this respect. These were the moments in which, most especially, the view of the disciple was entirely blended with the deeply stirred, yet solemn frame of his Master. The whole of the twenty-first chapter, also, is pervaded by that sabbatic peace which is best defined as the characteristic peculiarity of St John's mind. The Evangelist ends his narrative by truly reporting a falsely interpreted saying of Christ. Its full interpretation is reserved to the coming of Christ. Thus the end, when Christ the revealed Word will explain and illuminate the destinies of all, is connected with the beginning, in which the Word and the destinies of all were still resting in the bosom of the Father.

The ancient Church made a fitting selection in the symbol it appropriated to the fourth Evangelist. As the eagle in his lofty soaring attains, in a few great efforts, those pauses of still hovering, when he rests upon his outspread pinions, entranced by the glory of the sun, and, in transports of delight, bends his course towards it; so did the Evangelist quickly free himself from Galilee, from

John the Baptist, from the ideal of his mother Salome, and even from the expectation of having as much influence in his own way within the Church as Peter, or breaking up new ground in the world like Paul, and make it both the labour and rest of his life to contemplate and to exhibit the spiritual glory, the light of the world, in Christ and in His history. He was called, in profound and blessed contemplation, to perceive in the Gospel history, and in simple, yet sublime touches, to exhibit the ideal lights which break through Christ's words and works—the lyric tone of the peace which pervades His manner of acting and expressing Himself; the lightning-like flashes of the conflict between the Spirit of Christ and the spirit of the world, accompanied as they were by the rolling thunders; the life of Godhead in the sufferings of the Lamb, or the enjoyment of eternal peace in the depth of atoning woes; the dawn of the glorification of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Church. Hence his Gospel is the central point of ideal Christology, placing all those expressions of christological life which relate to it in their proper light, and teaching us rightly to estimate all the developments which have resulted from the dispersion of the fruitful seed of the divine Logos¹ throughout the world. All the guesses of philosophy that the unity of the Eternal Spirit was the ideal principle of the world—all genuine poetic feeling appearing as the blossom of a momentary union with the Eternal Spirit—all manifestations of pure enthusiasm which suffer thought to appear through the tone of feeling, and exhibit feeling in the light of thought; but especially all those inward festivals of Christian peace, in which hearts become so one with the Father in the Son, through the Holy Ghost, that the troubles and labours which had perplexed them are terminated—and all the outward festivals of the Church in which the greatest facts of history glitter with spiritual glory throughout the world, and ring aloud over the earth the eternal thoughts of God incorporated in established customs, so that the dawn of an eternal and untroubled Sabbath already appears upon the high places of the civilised world; in a word, all the incidents of festal spiritual life upon earth, in its reference to its eternal destination,—are echoes

¹ Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 46: οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιώσαντες Χριστιανοὶ εἴσι, καὶ ἂν ἄθεοι ἐνομιόθησαν, οἷον ἐν Ἑλλήσι μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡράκλειτος καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς, etc.

of the prevailing tone of this Gospel ; and if this apostle is regarded as a prince in the kingdom of Christ, possessing one of the twelve thrones, it may be said that he is the prince of that province whose situation is the highest, and whose beauty is the most tranquil,—that in his realm the noblest vines flourish on the high and picturesque mountains, whose very peaks are surrounded by a genial and fragrant atmosphere, while in the morning sun which illumines the gothic domes of his domains, and lights the festal processions upon their glittering paths, hovers the eagle that brought him his pen from the hand of the Lord.

If, then, the life of Christ is exhibited in the first Gospel with reference to the historical destiny of the world, and especially its tragic events ; in the second, to the powers of the world ; in the third, to the human heart, and especially the heart neglected, suffering, and feeling its need of consolation ; and in the fourth, to the eternal ideals, and to lyric and meditative views of them,—it still appears to us as unalterably one, under each new aspect, in every essential form of human life. This reference may, however, be viewed from four points of view. First, the Gospels teach us the difference of the instruments generally employed to communicate the Gospel, and enable us to estimate the value of this difference. Then, on the other hand, they point out the various forms and degrees of receptivity, and of felt need of salvation, existing in the world. If, then, we view the whole dark world in the light cast upon it by Christ's Gospel, we may say that we possess a Gospel of all tragic historical occurrences, a Gospel of all forces, a Gospel of all humanity, a Gospel of all ideality. When, however, we refer the variety of this negative fulness of the world, which Christ will fill and illumine, to Him the Head, He appears to us as the purely historical hero, in whom the suffering of the historical curse became, through perfected historical fidelity, the reconciliation of the world, the Gospel ; as the Lord of powers, whose harmony He restores, whose new doctrine it is, that with authority He commandeth even the unclean spirits, and who bequeaths to His disciples power over serpents and poisons (Mark xvi. 18) ; as fairest of the children of men, the friend of the human race, who listens to all the sighs of humanity, counts all its tears, who meets the funeral procession of mankind as He did that before the gate of Nain, as a helper and consoler ; and,

finally, as the Elect, the Only-begotten of the Father, in whom the Father beholds Himself, in whom the creative thought of God is one with reality, and whose glorification in the kingdom of the Spirit results in the recovery of the obscured ideality of the whole world, who elevates human nature with Himself into the free and blessed kingdom of the Spirit.

The four Gospels thus form a cycle in which Christ's glory is exhibited in the fulness of His life, and His nature developed in the four chief forms of life. Three of these forms stand in evidently sharp contrast to each other; they are symbolically designated by the three forms of animal life. But if the fourth, which is denoted by the figure of the man, is to represent merely the temperament or the higher unity of the other three forms, it would seem, indeed, that we might expect to find in Luke's Gospel a unity of the other three. Now it cannot be ignored that such a unity is actually presented, or, in other words, that the respective views of each separate Evangelist are re-echoed therein;—that of Matthew, for instance, in his communication of a genealogy and the notions connected therewith; that of Mark, in the exhibition of the constant miracles and journeys of Christ; and lastly, that of John, especially in the prominence given to the circumstance, that Jesus frequently continued whole nights in prayer (chap. vi. 1, ix. 29, xi. 1, xxi. 37). It is, however, equally true, that the peculiarity of Luke is, as we have already seen, strongly contrasted with the peculiarities of the other Evangelists. It would also oppose the idea of the organic relation of Christ to His Church, if His fulness were represented with equal power and emphasis by one instrument. How then shall we explain this apparent contradiction, that one Gospel should pre-eminently represent the divine humanity of Christ, and yet should not appear merely as the unity of the three others, which each give special prominence to one essential christological relation? We obtain an explanation of this difficulty by an accurate distinction between the different stages of human life. Man, as such, appears as the climax of creation, in whom the above-named general forms of life celebrate their higher unity. Paradisaic man, however, existed but for a short period; and historic man, as a fallen being, so lost that height and harmony of life, that he can now, in a humanity subject to weakness and limitation, appear as a special and separate form of life beside the three

animal forms; and it is in this limited condition that this fourth living creature represents the historical state of mankind. It is through its imperfect coincidence with the idea that history becomes tragic. It represents a deterioration, in which even that which is most noble in human nature generally appears only in fragments. In this dislocation of human powers, actual suffering, faithfulness and pure ideality seemed to be most widely separated. The one is struggling, suffering, bleeding, in the midst of the reality of actual national life. The other is soaring far above reality, in the regions of philosophy and poetry, and is often celebrating her highest triumphs while reality is at its most pitiable state of depression. Between these extremes of natural life are seen, on one side, the ardent zeal of powerful and pious spirits, exercised in manifold and energetic rebukes; on the other, that humanity, specially so called, which no sooner casts a look upon human need and misery, than, with a compassion which no prejudice can restrain, it makes it forthwith its life-task to soothe, to help, and to heal. This deterioration, however, of the christological element is put an end to in the life of Jesus. In Him, man as such, the ideal man, becomes historical; historic man, ideal. His life embraces, in wondrous union and harmony, and in infinite power, fulness, and purity, all the vital powers of humanity, all its aspirations after the heights of absolute perfection.

If, then, we glance once more at the prophetic symbol in which we have a typical reflection of the spiritual relations of human life, of Christology, and especially of the characteristic relations existing between the four Evangelists, the varying hues of signification in the fourth living creature (the human) may now be pointed out.

This human form first expresses the notion of the union of the three other living creatures; it has a reference to the ideal of human nature in its perfection. But it also represents man in his historical weakness and limitation, as he appears co-ordinately with the other forms as a fourth; not merely, perhaps, because the ox bleeds for him in symbolical worship, because the lion terrifies him, because the eagle soars over his head independently of him; but rather because his historic destiny, with its need of sacrifice, the heroic activity of the zealous messengers of God, and the sublime mysteries of ideal life ge-

nerally, confront him as strange and terrible powers, with whom he is outwardly combined, but not inwardly united. And when he would, in his highest efforts, unite himself with them, this union is ever but a partial one. If he sacrifices himself for the sake of his country, the lion opposes him as his destroyer, as was the case with Huss; if he walks in the ways of the lion, he often renders himself a grievous scourge to others, as proved by the Hussites; if he soars with the eagle, he generally forgets the wants of his fellow-men, as many idealists and mystics have done. Hence he is called upon, in his weakness, to concentrate himself, that he may do what is most human in a human manner, may check human misery with all the might of such divine strength as still remains in him, till the grace of God completes its work by guiding the ardent inward co-operation of those human powers which seem outwardly separated and severed, and restores harmony by the sending of the Son of man.

It is then limited humanity, rather than humanity in general, which is denoted by the cherubic symbol of the man. The notion of human unity, which is involved therein, is an indication of real unity, which was in many ways pointed to by the Holy of Holies of the Jewish temple as a unity to come, though it was definitely represented by no separate symbol, for the sake of giving the impression that it had not yet appeared. This unity was exemplified in an action, at the moment when the high priest tremblingly entered the Holy of Holies and sprinkled the mercy-seat. The tables of the law represented the roaring of the Lion of Judah; the sacrificial blood represented the Lamb of God, or sacrifice; the priest was the instrument of active compassion; the whole figure of the cherubim at such a moment, under the awe of the Lord's presence, spoke mysteriously of the eternal idea of the spirit of revelation. The power of this atonement was indeed only symbolic, and soon departed; it was founded, however, on the continual intervention and government of the incarnate love of God, in the depths of Israel's life.

When the God-man appeared in Christ, in whom the union of all human powers and forms of power was not only realized, but also confirmed and glorified, the old symbolism of the tabernacle had answered its purpose, and the actual life appeared in its place. But the life of Christ, which now entered the world to pervade it, and to change it into pure light and life, entered

it in that fourfold form of human life, that its whole fulness might be poured out therein, because it was only by such an entrance that it could certainly comprehend and win the world in all its forms of life; on the one hand, in all its instruments, on the other, in all its necessities.

There are individuals whose gifts remind us of Matthew, others who represent Mark, others again in whom resemblances to Luke or John appear. These all draw, according to their measure, from the fulness of Christ. For the reception of these manifold gifts there exist so many needs, these encounter the fulness of Christ in the form of utter poverty and nakedness. Wavering communities, ever ready to be unfaithful to themselves, need the heroes of suffering fidelity; weak multitudes, tormented by demons, cry for instruments of vigorous and delivering power; the poor and despised of this world long for the Gospel to heal their wounds through the angels of Christian philanthropy; the ever impending torpor of a dull realism and coarse utilitarianism needs sacred spirits who, themselves drawing from the source of eternal life, may be able to extend to the ageing Church the chalice of rejuvenescence.¹

The Church of Christ exhibits these fundamental forms wholesale. The priestly element in the Church reminds us of the view and gifts of Matthew; Mark seems to live again in energetic and powerful revival preachers; the founders of Christian institutions of mercy, the instruments of help to the needy of all kinds, represent the Lord according to Luke's view; while theology is radically after the style of John, and is indeed ever in a state of declension, when the tone of that apostle seems either strange or offensive to it. In the life of the Church this tone resounds in sacred songs.

These four forms, in their reference to the unity of the divine-human life, are reflected also in the Christian State. Justice and magistracy in the State, for instance, correspond with priestliness in the Church; administration and military order have an internal reference to their counterparts among the powers of the world to come; in those humane institutions by which the State cares for the relief of human need, especially in medical institutions, we find an echo of Christian pity; while, lastly, science and art will only correspond with their

¹ [Compare Westcott's *Introd.* p. 204.—ED.]

ideals, so far as they maintain their natural reference to the Church and theology, and through these as media, to Christ.

Since, then, Christ enters by His Spirit, according to these various forms, into His elect instruments, by them into His Church, by the Church into the State, and by the State into the whole world, He places the rights and value of human peculiarities in the clearest light, nay, protects them even in their form of relative partialities, whether these partialities are displayed in the prevalence of historical fidelity, theocratic activity, universal humanity, or quiet and contemplative idealism. Their rights are defended by the fact that they all exist in perfect harmony in Christ, and that in their united efforts they represent the fundamental forms of edification for His Church. It is only when they sever from or misconceive each other, and withdraw themselves from obedience to the Spirit of Christ, which would bind them together into a real unity, as they already, abstractedly considered, form an ideal one, and have the germ of a real one in Him, that they become blameable; *e.g.*, a humanity which seeks to sever itself from Christian firmness and power, a priestliness apart from the ideality of free judgment, an ideality removed from common life. In such forms they are but phantoms of the life they should exhibit, and even inimical to, and inconsistent with, that life. Hence modern preachers of apostolic succession, and clerical priests, are adversaries to the doctrine of the true atonement, and modern idealists are opponents of John. They are, however, but phantoms. For the Lord triumphantly continues His work, the development of His glory, by quickening and purifying faithful men who exhibit such partialities. It is from such partialities, so far as they remain Christian in their proportion and tendency, so far as they gravitate towards Christ, the centre of attraction to all life, that, as the result of the continuous purification which they receive from contact with each other, those peculiarities burst forth which develop in ever increasing brightness and beauty, that immortal germ which they bear within them. Ever more and more is one reflected in another, each in all; ever more and more do their contrasts become expressions of the fulness and power of their unity. It is in such a consecration that we behold the four Gospels. How manifold are the

contrasts they exhibit! As the eagle soars high above those living creatures who are chained by their nature to earth, so does John soar, in his ideality, above the other three Evangelists; on which account Clement of Alexandria, a partial and idealistic theologian, called his Gospel the spiritual, and dared to designate the others, as contrasted with his, the corporeal Gospels. On the other hand, Matthew differs from the other three by making historical truth, as it glorifies the true King of the Jews in His atoning sufferings, and the illustration furnished by the Old Testament to the New, the central points of his delineation. Mark also proportions his efforts to the aim he had in view; he leaves it to others to report the discourses of Jesus, and to delineate the inner workings of His life. His hero is the Lion who even in death shakes heaven and earth with His cry, and is soon upon the scene again, conquering and redeeming every creature. The aim of Luke, compared with that of the others, is displayed in the force of his universalism: he balances the seventy disciples for the world in general, against the twelve apostles for Israel. The position of the Gospels is also characteristic: the Gospel of historical truth and that of the ideal perfection of Christ are farthest apart; they form the advanced and rear guards of the company. Near to the Gospel of the Lord's powerful agency stands the Gospel of His mild and compassionate control, the Angel next the Lion. And if the combination of the two first Gospels exhibits the Lord under the contrast of victim and sacrificer, the combination of the two latter expresses the contrast of love ever acting in prayer, and love ever praying in the midst of action. The unity of all is, however, expressed in the fact that they all form but one Gospel, that they all glorify the one Christ.

It will now, therefore, be our task to exhibit first of all that representation of the life of Jesus which is derived from the four Gospels in combination, and then to bring prominently forward, by an examination of each separate Gospel, the specific nature of their respective views of Christ. These examinations will indeed be but attempts, but even with all their deficiencies they may direct attention to the delicate yet decided organic unity of the four Gospel forms of life, and the indissolubility of their organisms; and if this be in any measure their result, the nuisance of the now prevailing atomistic and talmudistic criticism of the

Gospels will be stopped in its career. The greater advantage, however, would be the positive one of more decidedly exhibiting the fulness of Christ in the Gospels, their variety being made the clearer by the more developed delineation of their unity, their unity by a nicer discrimination of their variety.

NOTES.

1. Of the apostolic labours of Matthew, especially his later ones beyond the limits of Palestine, and of his end, tradition has much to tell (comp. Winer, *R. W. B.* i. 73). Eusebius relates that, after writing his Gospel, he directed his efforts to other nations (iii. 24). His new sphere of labour has been variously designated by various authorities. Macedonia, Upper Syria, Persia, Parthia, and Media, have each been named, but the tradition which points out Ethiopia as the scene of his ministry has received most credit. In the times of Clement of Alexandria his martyrdom was not known of, but a severe ascetic course of life was ascribed to him. He was subsequently reckoned among the martyrs. A comparison of the passage in his Gospel (chap. xxiv. 15, etc.) which seems to hint that the time for the departure of the Christians from Jerusalem was at hand, with the statement of Eusebius, that the Christians departed to Pella, a town in the hilly district beyond Jordan, would lead us to seek for the last traces of Matthew in this direction. Pantænus (according to Eusebius) afterwards found his Gospel, in the Hebrew language, in the hands of the Christians of a country called India, by which we must probably understand Arabia (Neander, *Church History* i. 113 [Bohn's Tr.]). In this direction, then, *i.e.*, beyond Pella and towards Arabia, Matthew seems to have terminated his career. It is Bartholomew, however, whom Eusebius designates as properly the apostle of the Arabians.

2. Tradition is very unanimous in its accounts, that Mark left Rome to preach the Gospel in Egypt, where he founded Christian churches, and became the first Bishop of Alexandria. According to Jerome, he died in the eighth year of Nero's reign. According to the Alexandrian Chronicle, he suffered martyrdom in the reign of Trajan, being burned by the idolaters.

3. The tradition that Luke was a painter is of very recent origin. It is found in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Nicephorus, who wrote in the fourteenth century. According to Eusebius

Luke preached in Dalmatia, Gaul, Italy, and Macedonia. Nicephorus also makes his labours lie in the same direction, by reporting that he suffered martyrdom in Greece. According to Isidorus Hispalensis and the Martyrologies, he died in Bithynia.

4. When Paul was at Jerusalem for the last time (Acts xxi. 18), John seems to have been no longer there. It is probable that the Virgin was already dead, and that he had departed thence. Whither 'John first betook himself after leaving Jerusalem,' says Credner (*Einl.* 215), 'is a circumstance veiled in utter obscurity. It could not have been to Ephesus, as Paul would then have avoided that place (comp. Rom. xv. 20, 2 Cor. x. 16, Gal. ii. 7, 8), and would also have spoken in different terms to the Ephesian elders on his return from his third journey. Neither can we admit the presence of John at Ephesus at the time when Paul sent the Epistle to the Ephesians into those districts. But that he was really there subsequently, is testified by history (Iren. *adv. hæres.* iii. 3. 4).' According to Clement of Alexandria, he was banished for a time to the island of Patmos by a tyrant, and came to Ephesus after the death of his persecutor. Domitian is afterwards named as the tyrant by whom John was banished. Tertullian relates the tradition, that John was, before his banishment, thrown into boiling oil at Rome, without suffering any harm. According to Irenæus, he lived till the time of Trajan. Epiphanius says that he attained the age of ninety-four; Chrysostom, that he lived to be one hundred and twenty. On the traditions concerning his advanced years, comp. Neander, *Planting and Training, etc.*, i. 411 [Bohn's Ed.].

According to Mark iii. 17, John, together with his brother James, received a surname from the Lord Jesus. They were called Boanerges. Von Ammon supposes (*Gesch. des Lebens Jesu*, p. 77) that Mark translated this word incorrectly, *sons of thunder*, and that it rather means *hot-headed ones*. Mark, however, is not merely the reporter of the Hebrew, but also of the Greek expression, and it is not as a translator but as an Evangelist that he gives the Greek name. As a Hebrew too, he must well have known that רגז might be so rendered. This designation of the sons of Zebedee has often been referred to their expression of indignation, when they desired to call down fire from heaven upon a Samaritan town, because it did not receive the Lord Jesus (Luke ix. 51). Concerning this name, comp. the

article of Gurlitt in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1829, No. 4; and that of the author in the same periodical for the year 1839, No. 1, *Ueber die Authentie der vier Evang.* p. 60. The Lord would scarcely have bestowed upon His disciples a surname which would have attached to them a lasting stigma; nor could He, with His perfect knowledge of nature, look upon thunder as merely a 'senseless destructive power,' and employ it as a symbolic name in this sense; the phenomenon of thunder was surely too significant, beautiful, and holy in His eyes, for such a purpose. Undoubtedly, thunder was to His mind a sublime phenomenon, testifying to the Father's glory. In fact, neither moral praise nor moral blame seem intended in this designation. The word denotes a special temperament. As Simon was surnamed a rock, on account of his manly, powerful, and zealous activity, so were James and John surnamed sons of thunder, on account of their calm and lofty temperament, which could yet suddenly flash forth into light and power like lightning. The word was the indorsement of their peculiarity and of their process of development; it included both the reproof of their sinful effervescence, and the loving acknowledgment of the characteristic features of their noble and soaring spirits. [The etymology and significance of this name are most fully considered by Lampe, in his *Comment. in Joan. Proleg.* i. 2.—ED.]

SECOND BOOK.

THE HISTORICAL DELINEATION OF THE LIFE OF JESUS.

PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION.

SECTION I.

THE PRINCIPAL CHRONOLOGICAL PERIODS ASCERTAINED.

IN undertaking a chronologically arranged history of the life of the Lord Jesus Christ, our first task must necessarily be a comparison of the four Gospels, with reference to the order of events communicated by their respective statements.¹ If apparent or actual discrepancies are discovered by this process, our next effort must be an attempt to ascertain the true sequence; and when this has been discovered, to point out, and if possible to explain, the several departures therefrom, by the peculiar position of the Evangelist with respect to the objective Gospel history.

That the Evangelists do not all relate events in the same order, is an acknowledged fact. Of late, indeed, a considerable mass of seeming discrepancies have been added to these actual discrepancies; as, *e.g.*, by the view that John relates the call

¹ [‘Singuli non sufficiunt ad chronologiam historiæ de Jesu Christo coagmentandam: conjuncti, satisfaciunt, ita inter se congruentes, ut unius operis instar sint eorum scripta.’ Bengel’s *Ordo Temporum*, p. 267 (ed. 1741).—ED.]

of the first disciples as taking place at a period differing from that stated by the synoptists, reports Christ's agony before His crucifixion, and at another place, and differs from them also concerning the day of the crucifixion. But though a more thorough comprehension of the Gospel history scatters such obscurities as these, it yet brings also into clearer light such discrepancies of chronology as actually exist. Those arising from a comparison between John and the synoptists may first be noticed. According to the latter (Matt. iv. 12; Mark i. 14; Luke iv. 14), it might be assumed that Jesus commenced His public ministry in Galilee, and that, indeed, after John had been cast into prison; while from the statement of John it appears, that Jesus, after His first public appearance in Jerusalem, laboured for a period, contemporaneously with the Baptist, in Judea. The discrepancy may, indeed, be reduced to a merely seeming one, arising from an inaccuracy in the earlier Evangelists, viz., that they all omit Christ's first official attendance at the Pass-over, and thus confuse His return from the banks of Jordan after His baptism with His return from the same place after that festival. The inaccuracy is certainly sufficiently prominent to assume the appearance of an actual discrepancy, until it is explained by the origin of the first three Gospels. But even the synoptists, independently considered, often differ in details in their respective orders. In the history of the temptation, for instance, Matthew makes the temptation upon the pinnacle of the temple precede that upon the high mountain; while Luke inverts this order. The latter places the occurrence at Nazareth, and the inimical disposition of the Nazarenes to the Lord, before His journeyings (chap. iv. 16); while Matthew brings forward this event after Jesus had already been sojourning some time at Capernaum (xiii. 54). The different positions occupied by the Lord's prayer in these two Gospels may also be mentioned here (Matt. vi. 9; Luke xi. 2); while an inspection of a synopsis will immediately show other details which might be added. Finally, the Evangelist Luke seems even to confuse his own order, by relating Christ's entry into Bethany at chap. x. 38, and then saying, chap. xvii. 11, that He passed through the midst of Samaria and Galilee; though this, indeed, may be explained by the remark, that he gives the occurrences of several journeys consecutively. If, then, the fact is proved, that the Evangelists

thus frequently differ from each other as to the order of events, the question arises, what is the rule by which their statements are to be reconciled?

First, we meet with the arrangement which attributes to each Evangelist an equal, and even perfect correctness, with respect to the matter in question. This result of harmony was connected with the rigidity of ancient, and especially of Lutheran orthodoxy. Andrew Osiander, in his *Harmonia Evangeliorum*, proceeds upon the principle, that ‘since the Evangelists were inspired, they could not but write truth, and consequently gave the discourses of Jesus *verbatim*, and His discourses and acts in strictest consecutive order. Now as each of the four Evangelists is said to have written in consecutive order, while the same events are recorded at an earlier period by one, and at a later by others, no resource is left us but to take evidently parallel and identical occurrences for non-identical, and to suppose that the same occurrence, accompanied by the same circumstances, was frequently repeated.’¹ A composition would consequently have to be made, into which all these repetitions must be compressed. A want of life was the fundamental fault of this view, by which a perplexed, confusing multiplicity of Gospel facts, a multiplicity resting upon a very precarious tenure, was obtained, and the great, clear, and self-certifying unity of the Gospel history was lost.² After the view of Osiander was abandoned, it became necessary to consider the separate Evangelists, with a view to discover which among them had preserved the groundwork of the true sequence, according to which the statements of the rest were to be arranged. Chemnitz (*Harmoniæ Evangelicæ*) decided for Matthew, yet did not follow him throughout. J. A. Bengel also (*Richtige Harmonie der Evang.*) considered that Matthew had observed chronological order, while Mark and Luke had allowed themselves more freedom than this would give them. The assumption that Matthew at least gives us to understand that he intended to write with strict regard to chronology, has of late been made use of in opposing the credibility of his Gospel. On the other hand, however, the persuasion that

¹ See Ebrard, *Gospel History*, pp. 49 and 58. [The blindness of sensible and learned men to any other than chronological order is exhibited by Bishop Marsh in the third volume of his edition of Michaelis, Pt. ii. p. 16.—ED.]

² See Ebrard.

Matthew groups events according to their real connection, and follows this order in his statements, has been expressed with increasing certainty, especially by Olshausen (*Commentary on the Gospels*, Introd. p. 18), Hase (*Das Leben Jesu*, p. 3), Ebrard (*Gospel History*, p. 66).

They who regard the Gospel of Mark as the basis of the two other synoptical Gospels, cannot but give it the preference with regard to chronology also; as, *e.g.*, Weisse (*die Evang. Gesch.* i. 66, 295). As the critical fates would have it, Mark obtained a recognition in this respect even from Schleiermacher, who, wishing to prove that the testimony of Papias does not apply to our extant Gospel according to Mark, refers to the declaration of Papias, that Mark wrote *ὁ τάξει*, while the present Gospel evidently follows a chronological order and decided plan. The chronological sequence of Mark is indeed frequently such, that everything takes place *εὐθέως*, in rapid succession. His order is, at all events, generally founded on the true order, as will be subsequently shown. Others again (compare Schott, *Isagoge*, p. 107; Zahn, *Das Reich Gottes auf Erden*, Pt. ii. p. 4) give Luke the preference. But the third Gospel, as before pointed out, exhibits as little as the first and second, a distinctly arranged order in details. ‘In the course of this Gospel, a similar indistinctness concerning the sequence of events is manifested, as in the other two; Luke, for the most part, narrates event after event, without any notice of time (chap. iv. 16, 31, v. 12, etc.), and sometimes alternately uses the indefinite transitions *μετὰ ταῦτα* (v. 27), *ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν* (v. 17, viii. 22, etc.).’ Olshausen, *Commentary* i. 19.

Our inquiries after the true order have now brought us to the Gospel of John. And here also that ruling spirit of the Evangelists, which found higher and certainly more important principles to influence their delineations of the life of Christ than those of chronological sequence, seems to cut off all hope of obtaining abundant chronological foundations. The principle of John’s view of the Gospel was a decidedly ideal and christological one; we are not therefore surprised to find that the leading incidents of his development do not coincide with the leading chronological periods. B. Jakobi¹ rightly remarks,

¹ On the data for the chronology of the life of Jesus, in John’s Gospel, by B. Jacobi, in the *Theol. Studien und Kritiken*, 1831, No. 3.

‘The definitions of time in this Gospel are so delivered, that it is seen that the question with John is not to furnish a chronological, and least of all a complete chronological sketch of the life of Christ. Notes of time, when they are found, serve for the most part only to aid our conception of the position of an event or discourse; or to explain some circumstance of the narrative; or they obtrude themselves upon the narrator without design on his part, as integral parts of the occurrence which he is relating, by vivid representations of his own past experiences.’ In confirmation of this may be cited the circumstance, that John does not more nearly define the feast of the Jews, chap. v. 1, and thereby introduces an element of uncertainty into his chronology of the life of Jesus, which has presented many difficulties to investigators. Nevertheless Jakobi rightly asserts, that the Gospel of John must always furnish the foundation, according to which the statements of the other Evangelists must be arranged, with respect to their historical sequence; though he expresses this assertion too strongly in the remark, that this Gospel is the only representation of the life of Jesus which is authentic, thoroughly credible, and, though very incomplete, yet perfectly self-consistent and accurate in all its several details, etc. Ebrard also expresses his conviction, that it was the intention of John to write consecutively and chronologically (p. 121). Neander is of the same opinion. He shows¹ that, from the circumstance that the paschal festival is only once mentioned by the synoptists, and that at the close of Christ’s earthly course, nothing further could, in the absence of other chronological indications, be inferred. The mention of the Passover feast might have been omitted, as well as other notes of time. But since nothing is found in the first Gospels which opposes the notion that Christ’s ministry extended over more years than one; since it is improbable in itself, that it should have lasted but one year; and since even in Luke a passing remark occurs which necessarily assumes the intervention of a Passover during Christ’s public ministry (the *σάββατον δευτερόπρωτον*, Luke vi., in combination with the ripe ears of corn); all this is in favour of John, who mentions the different Passovers. After further discussing this subject, Neander rightly remarks, ‘If then it is to this Gospel alone that we are indebted

¹ *Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 163 [Bohn’s Ed.].

for a chronologically arranged and practically connected representation of the public ministry of Jesus, a very favourable light is thus thrown upon its origin and historical character.' Wieseler completes this estimation of the Gospel of John by the remark, that Luke also offers several special and important dates; *e.g.*, chap. ii. 1, 2, iii. 23, iii. 1, 2; Acts i. 1, 3: he consequently regards the two last Evangelists 'as peculiarly his guides and authorities' in his chronological investigations (*Chr. Syn.* p. 25).

The actual disparity between the three first Gospels and the fourth, must, besides the reasons already offered, be referred especially to the disparity between the circle of general evangelical tradition and the circle of John's reminiscences. When Christ attended the first Passover, He had not yet called the greater number of His apostles; and this applies especially to Matthew. His four first disciples, however, had only entered upon their first close intercourse with Him, and did not become His assistants and companions till afterwards (comp. Matt. iv. 12, 18). Anything remarkable, therefore, that might have occurred at the first Passover, could not have been so vividly impressed upon the minds of those first disciples, as those subsequent events to which they were called to testify. The deep doctrinal transaction between Christ and Nicodemus must have been committed to the remembrance of His most confidential disciple by the Lord Himself. But the public purification of the temple, a circumstance widely known, and which the disciples would have heard of, was without difficulty inserted in the tradition of that Passover around which so many manifestations of Christ were concentrated; and the more so, since a similar expression of Christ's displeasure at this old abuse probably recurred.¹ If Jesus, as we must suppose, went up to the second Passover, this visit was, on account of circumstances, strictly private. At the minor festivals, however, which He frequented, christological discussions, of which most of the disciples had then no mature appreciation, arose between Himself and the Jews; John alone was capable of preserving their profound matter, by the power of his love and anticipative penetration. The interval between the first and third Passover was, on the contrary, chiefly filled up by the popular ministry of Christ in

¹ [It will be seen below that the author decidedly favours this latter view.—ED.]

Galilee; and hence it was this ministry which formed the chief material of the reminiscences of most of the disciples. It is probable that at the commencement of Christ's last ministry in Judea and Jerusalem, He was accompanied only by some and not by all His disciples; while during the subsequent trying days before the crisis, most of them were so excited and agitated, that it was only upon so calm and profound a mind as John's that incidents of such a kind as the high-priestly prayer would make an accurate impression. And though John lived in continual intercourse with the other disciples, yet the psychical preponderance of the majority could not but decidedly influence the prevailing form of apostolical tradition. If, finally, we accept the view, that John afterwards found a delineation of this tradition in existence, it follows that he would feel all the greater impulse to write that which was peculiarly his own. He was, besides, one of those disciples of the Baptist, whose hearts had kindled towards the Saviour after His baptism, through the testimony of the Baptist, and the manifestation of His own glory. Of what occurred at this period, he had the most vivid remembrance (John i. 35, etc.). He had also special connections in Jerusalem. It is probable that an attempt was at one time made, on the part of the high priest's family, to get information from him with respect to his Master; and that his pure and childlike spirit had withstood the temptation, without coming to an open rupture. Hence he best understood the nature of the conflict at Jerusalem. His turn, too, for religious speculation specially fitted him to preserve and give a form to the strictly christological discussions between Christ and His enemies. It was thus that the difference originated between the sphere of his reminiscences, and that of the general evangelical tradition.

It will result from our statement, that the material of the three first Evangelists unites harmoniously with the chronological plan of John's narrative, into one rich whole.

But if the Gospel of John is made the foundation of our delineation with respect to the ministry of Christ, everything will depend upon clearing up the one uncertain point in the midst of it, viz., as to what feast of the Jews is intended in chap. v. 1.¹ Every possible Jewish festival has been supposed

¹ For exegetical discussions, comp. Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 211, and Lücke's *Commentar in loc.*

to be intended by these words. But the question has been more and more reduced to the alternative, that either the Passover or the feast of Purim must be the one alluded to.¹ For Jesus returned before attending this festival (most probably at seed-time, according to John iv. 35), after His first long sojourn in Judea, through Samaria to Galilee, perhaps about November or December. At this time both the feasts of Pentecost and Tabernacles would be already past. The feast of the Dedication of the Temple (*ἐγκαίνια*), however, which was celebrated in the month of December (from the 25th of the month Chisleu), was too near to have left sufficient time between the return to Galilee and this festival for the lengthened ministry in Galilee, which took place in the interval. Consequently, either the feast of Purim, or the Passover of the succeeding spring, must be intended. If, then, this is the alternative to be decided on, the difference between the readings, *ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων* and *ἑορτή*, etc., without the article, is of the utmost importance. If the reading with the article is correct, and consequently the feast of the Jews simply is intended, the preference must be absolutely given to the Passover over the feast of Purim. We should then, indeed, be forced to interpose between this Passover and that mentioned chap. vi. 4, a whole year which would be entirely barren of events. But since the reading with the article is considered unguine by the oldest and most important evidence (comp. Lücke and Wieseler²), the want of the article

¹ The feast of Purim, or the feast of Lots (comp. Esth. ix.), in remembrance of the great change of lots, one of which, according to Haman's design, was to bring about the destruction of Israel, the other of which, according to God's counsel, brought a ruinous retribution upon him and the enemies of Israel in general, was celebrated on the fourteenth and fifteenth of the month Adar, which immediately preceded the paschal month, Nisan. [See Hengstenberg's *Christology* iii. 241. The character of the feast of Purim has been urged, and not without reason, against the likelihood of Jesus being present at it. 'Thus much is certain, it hath had the effect, which mere human institutions in matters of religion very commonly have, to occasion corruption and licentiousness of manners, rather than to promote piety and virtue. The Jews . . . make it a sort of rule of their religion to drink till they can no longer distinguish between the blessing of Mordecai and the cursing of Haman. Insomuch that Archbishop Usher styles the feast of Purim the Bacchanalia of the Jews.' Jennings's *Jewish Antiquities*, p. 544.—ED.]

² [Tischendorf, however, retains the article.—ED.]

alone would incline us to the opposite view. For if merely a feast is spoken of, we should naturally conclude that one of the minor ones was intended. And when, finally, in connection with this notice, the Passover is immediately afterwards spoken of as nigh, we cannot but infer that the feast which was so near to the Passover, and preceded it with so little prominence, could be none other than the feast of Purim. This view is, after the precedent of Kepler, supported by Petavius, Tholuck, Ols-hausen, Neander, Krabbe, Winer, Jakobi, Ebrard, Wieseler, and others.¹ It will be seen hereafter how well it accords with the inward connection of facts in the Lord's life.

Hence the public ministry of Christ was exercised, almost entirely, during the space of two years; a period including three Passovers,—the time of the first preparation for His public appearance alone, preceding the first Passover. The whole series of events, however, which this interval embraces, cannot be divided according to the several Passovers, since these occur partly in the midst of certain stages of the Gospel history, while the feast of Purim (John v.), on the contrary, forms a decided turning-point of relations. For till this feast, the enthusiasm with which the Jewish people first welcomed Christ still prevailed, and His ministry was, in spite of sundry gentle warnings, restrictions, and isolated attacks, an uninterrupted and public one. But at this feast a decided collision took place between Christ and the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem. From this time forth 'the Jews' persecuted, and sought to kill Him (John v. 16, comp. John vii. 13, 19, 21–23, 25). It was only occasionally, and when protected by the astonished multitude, that Jesus could henceforth freely appear among the people, being obliged, for the most part, to withdraw into Galilee, and subsequently into Perea, while even in these regions He was ever so involved in fresh conflicts with the excited pharisaic spirit, as to be continually obliged to change His place of sojourn by flight; now appearing in a district, and again as quickly disappearing from it. This period lasts till the time of His journey to His last Passover, when, with the knowledge that the crisis is now at hand, He appeared freely in public, surrendering Himself both

¹ [For a full statement of opinions and discussion of the question, see Greswell's *Dissertations* ii., Dis. xxiii.; or Andrews' *Life of our Lord*, pp. 155–162.—ED.]

to the homage of the people, and to His own trial. Having made these remarks, we may now proceed to define the separate periods of Christ's life.

NOTES.

1. Even the difference which is felt to exist between the teaching of Jesus in John and the synoptists, may be explained by the reasons given above for the difference of their selection of facts. When Jesus delivered those discourses to the multitudes, which the synoptists so delight to relate, parables and apophthegms were quite in place. When, on the contrary, He entered into those discussions with His adversaries, the chief points of which are given by John, this form of instruction was but partially applicable. A second explanation lies in the fact, that the three first Evangelists had, for the most part, anticipated the fourth in delivering this most comprehensible kind of instruction, namely, the parabolic and sententious; and that it also was part of the peculiarity of John, from the first to appropriate the symbolic and speculative elements of Christ's teaching. We may finally remark, that in John, as well as in the synoptists, the direct didactic form is not wanting in the parabolic discourses. Comp. Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte*, p. 312, etc.

2. It by no means follows from the circumstance, that the several synoptical Evangelists do not relate the events of the Gospel history in direct chronological sequence, that they pay no regard to the great leading chronological features. Nay, even in those very groupings of the several occurrences which depend upon actual or traditional motives, they undoubtedly form single groups according to chronological sequence. Ebrard distinguishes in this respect (p. 65, etc.) between 'chains' and 'syndesms.' By the former he understands a series of consecutive, interdependent events; by the latter, a definite concatenation of such *chains*.

3. Weisse expresses (*Ev. Gesch.* i. 292) the opinion, that we need for the public teaching of Christ, 'a period of not too small a series of years.' In this view he opposes the authority of the fourth Evangelist, and appeals to the authority of Irenæus, who 'makes the most celebrated events in the life of Jesus take place between His fortieth and fiftieth years.' Irenæus

æus, however, specially supported this statement by the passage John viii. 57, in which the Jews remark to Jesus, 'Thou art not yet fifty years old.' According then to this author, we are to attach more credit to the fourth Gospel through the intervention of Irenæus, *i.e.*, to an arbitrary interpretation of it by Irenæus, than to this same fourth Gospel itself, in its direct chronological statements. With respect also to the locality of Christ's ministry, Weisse sets himself in direct opposition to the fourth Gospel, 'which relates repeated visits to the festivals at Jerusalem' (p. 293). The custom of journeying to the feasts is said to have no longer been so general in the days of Christ, as in the early and simpler times of the Jewish nation (p. 306). 'So slavish a subjection to the ceremonial law as must be assumed to necessitate these journeys to the feasts,' it is further said, 'is opposed to all church doctrinal views of the dignity of the Messiah.' Jesus is therefore said to have 'probably laboured many years' in Galilee, without frequenting any feasts, and then perhaps at length, influenced by the perception that His miraculous power was declining (p. 431), to have seized the resolution, and uttered the great saying, that He must go up to Jerusalem to be delivered up to His enemies, to be ill-used and put to death by them. This hypothesis gives a monstrous representation of the personality and agency of Jesus. Only imagine a prophet of Israel absenting himself for years from the great feasts of his nation, and yet maintaining his prophetic credit in the eyes of the people journeying to the feasts; a saviour remaining in isolated Galilee, while the people were thronging to Jerusalem; a reformer of the theocracy entering the external centre of this theocracy only at the end of his course, and to die! Not only would the religious, but even the moral feeling of the people of Galilee have rejected Him; for visits to the feasts were in their eyes not only a religious, but a civil duty, a sacred national custom.¹ According to this

¹ Comp. G. Schweitzer, *der Christenglaube an Jesum von Nazareth*, p. 319. According to Weisse, p. 296, Mark, in the passage chap. xi. 11, is said to represent Jesus, 'who had just entered Jerusalem, as looking around Him on all things in the temple, as one would do to whom all was still new and strange.' Just perhaps like some aged Catholic country man who comes for the first time to Cologne, and, after looking at the cathedral with astonishment, departs on his business.

hypothesis, Christ's journey to Jerusalem to die there, was but an act of fanatical caprice. The assumption that Christ must have considered these visits to the festivals a slavish subjection to the ceremonial law, deserves no discussion. Besides, the critic is not only in opposition to St John, but also to the synoptists (comp. Matt. xxiii. 37, xxvii. 58).¹

4. The Gospel of St John clears up the chronological obscurities of the three first Gospels. After the miracle which Jesus performed on the Sabbath, according to John v., the Jewish party at Jerusalem began to persecute Him. The retirement which the Lord from this time observed, for the sake of obtaining time sufficient for the completion of His ministry, was probably the cause of His attending the next Passover in private, and unattended by His disciples (chap. vi. 4), but not of His avoiding it. One consequence of this was, that this chronological period, as well as the first Passover, escaped most of His disciples, because they were then not yet among His followers.²

SECTION II.

THE PERIODS OF CHRIST'S LIFE.

A delineation of the facts of Christ's life owes it to that great and world-famed subject whereof it treats, that it should view it not only in its internal, but also in its external connection, and therefore according to the causes and effects by which it is linked with the world's history, and forms its central point. In the present work, indeed, the actual delineation of the life of

¹ [A full account of the literature on the duration of our Lord's ministry is given in Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol. iii. Pt. 2, pp. 56-67.—ED.]

² [A list of harmonies is given by Marsh in the above-cited work, but it is both too full for practical purposes, and also composed mainly of works which are now superseded. Upwards of 150 are collected by Hase (*Leben Jesu*, p. 21, ed. 1854), though the works of Stroud, Greswell, and Robinson are all omitted from this list. Selected lists are given by Tischendorf in his own very valuable and accessible *Synopsis Evangelica* (Lips. 1854); and by Ellicott in his *Historical Lectures*, etc., p. 15, note. The great principles of harmony are laid down by Michaelis (iii. 14), but are expressed in a more concise, scientific, and trustworthy manner by Ebrard (p. 57, etc.).—ED.]

Jesus forms only the middle division of a more comprehensive treatment of the subject, according to the plan of which, the general causes and effects of Christ's life in the world's history had to be discussed in the first division. The more immediate relations, however, by which this life was connected with the history of mankind, must be brought forward together with the facts of His life. The history of this life will therefore commence with a description of that period of universal history during which Christ laboured; we must see the scene upon which He lived and worked. At the close of this life, too, we must obtain a general view of His agency and influence upon mankind. These two examinations, as prologue and epilogue, together with our delineation of the life of Jesus, will form a whole, which would thus cause this Second Book to consist of three parts, besides the Introduction. The several periods, however, of the life itself are of such importance, that they must be treated as chief divisions or 'parts' of the whole book, if its contents are to be developed in just and regular proportions.

The First Part, then, will present the historical sphere of Christ's life, and describe the relations of time and place by which He was surrounded. The several periods of His life will follow: the history of His childhood; the preparations for His public appearance in Israel; the time of His free agency amidst the enthusiastic welcome of His countrymen; the conflicts between Christ and the corrupt national spirit of the Jews, causing the Lord to observe a holy retirement; the last decided surrender of Christ to the enthusiasm of His people; the treachery of His people, which brought about His condemnation at the world's bar, and His death upon the cross; and finally, the manifestation of His glory in His resurrection and ascension. Thus the periods of Christ's life form our next seven parts. The ninth and last will conclude the work with a retrospect of His life; depicting, first, His whole manifestation to, and influence upon, mankind; and finally, the enduring effect of His life.¹

¹ Wieseler comprises the events from the public appearance of John the Baptist till the feast of Purim, John v., in *one* section, and His journey to the feast of Tabernacles in another section (*Synopse*, p. 31). His division displays an intimate acquaintance with the subject. Many more recent divisions testify to the despair of their authors, in their attempt to discover the connection of the Gospel history.

PART I.

THE HISTORICAL SPHERE OF CHRIST'S LIFE.

SECTION I.

THE RELATIONS OF TIME AND PLACE AMONG WHICH CHRIST APPEARED.

IT was as a prophet of Israel that Christ entered upon His public ministry; His abode was in an inconsiderable district of the Jewish land; His age was coincident with about the middle of that of the first Roman emperors. With respect to the ordinary view of the circumstances of the world, He lived, as far as locality is concerned, in a corner of the world, and, as far as time is concerned, in the midst of a great period. With respect, however, to the proper and actual view of the circumstances of the world, His appearance constituted the fulness of time. The pre-Christian development of mankind came to a close with Him; the æon of the ancient times was ended. The maturity of the ancient times was manifested by great points of union in its several tendencies, and altogether became, by the strictest inward relations, one great unity, in which the significance of the time was concentrated. In the life of Jesus, all the powers of the world concurred to bring about the catastrophe which was at once the world's condemnation and deliverance.

In Christ Himself was perfected the development of the true lineage of humanity, of the sacred commerce between heaven and earth, or of the christological life. Heavenly humanity appeared in the Son of man in its concentration, in its personal unity, filled with the quickening Spirit, and in this divine fulness, mighty to save. Thus did Christ appear as the honour and climax of human nature, its positive unity and holiness.

But the appearance of this positive unity was met by its negative; viz., by the fact that humanity, as a whole, had now come to a state of mature receptivity. Humanity had now become a world (*οἰκουμένη*) both needing, and capable of, redemption; a world united in government, civilisation, and language; in preparedness for the manifestation of God in the flesh; in religious knowledge and expectation; by the exigencies of ruin, by despair, by yearning and desire, had the gates been widened, and the world's doors thrown open for the King of glory to come in. The earthly glory of Judaism had decayed, and its best instruments were therefore capable of understanding and accepting the Messiah of a spiritual world, the King of the kingdom of truth. The heathen world, on the contrary, was, through some of its noblest sons, the proselytes of the gate and of righteousness, everywhere acquainted with the actual historical Monotheism of the synagogue,¹ which must be well distinguished from heathen abstract Monotheism—a Monotheism merely philosophical in its tenets, and cowardly in its utterances—and had reached just that frame of mind in which only the highest, the ultimate word of this Monotheism, the Gospel, was wanting. This unity, which we, according to the analogy of polar relations, designate negative, corresponded with the positive unity: the fulness of life, and the life to be filled, the positive and negative *pleroma* (John i. 16; Eph. i. 23), were mutually present; hence the fulness of the time was come, the beginning of the marriage festival, in which the union of the Lord with His Church is to take place.

The incarnation of the Son of God and the glorification of humanity did not, however, take place among a sinless generation, but in a world fallen and degenerate. Hence this manifestation could only be effected under the grave form of redemption, the redemption only under the terrible form of a sentence of death. The concentration of light was encountered by the concentration

¹ [The leavening of the heathen world by Jewish influences, the condition of the Jewish people themselves, and the prevalent expectation of a Messiah, are excellently treated by Ewald (*Geschichte Christus und seiner Zeit*, p. 55, etc., 2d ed.). And besides the Church histories, see on these same points Bishop Blomfield's *Traditional Knowledge of a Promised Redeemer*. Much also may be learnt from Trench's exquisite *Hulsean Lectures on Christ the Desire of all nations*.—ED.]

of darkness ; and as, on the one side, the Holy One of Israel united with the world's receptivity, so, on the other side, did the corrupt external pietism of Israel, which ripened into obduracy in presence of the actual holiness of Christ, unite with the corruption of the heathen world, which had now attained its climax, in the resolution to reject Him, and therefore in the guilt by which the unbelieving world condemned itself. It was not till this sentence was passed, that Christ could be perfected as the Redeemer of such a world (Heb. ii. 10), or the world become capable of receiving such a Redeemer (Gal. vi. 14).

The corruption of this spurious, externalized piety among that chosen nation, whose external aspect had symbolically represented, and whose inmost nature had actually represented, the positive pole of the manifestation, appears in the fact, that in the greater number of its members, the pretension to external holiness was most decidedly prominent where there was most lack of it internally. But the spuriousness of this pretension, and the completeness of the corruption therein manifested, were displayed in the three forms it assumed, which, as separate parties, were utterly at variance with each other. The most respected and dominant sect was that of the Pharisees, the casuistic and trifling interpreters of the law ; their holiness consisted chiefly in that rank over-growth of precepts and observances with which they stifled and corrupted revelation. They were strangers to the spiritual character of Old Testament Christology ; the increase of forms and observances was to them in the place of the increase of life ; while the reform or criticism of their traditions was an abomination to them. But while the Pharisees designated the whole mass of legal tradition in Israel as sacred, the Sadducees left to the Old Testament development of revelation only its first beginnings ; their holiness consisted in converting the Mosaic law into a final, deistic, moral law, and boasted of righteousness in an observance of this mutilation of it. Thus they misconceived the development of the theocratic seed exhibited in the prophets, and deadened the germinating power and vitality of the Mosaic law itself by their view of it ; their standpoint being the miserable one of an abstract negation. Besides these corruptions, which may be distinguished, the one as an adding to, the other as a taking from revelation, there was but a third possible, namely, its alteration. This was represented in the

system of the Essenes, who sought their holiness in separating the spiritual elements of the theocracy from their true connection, and exhibiting them mingled with heathen notions, in an unreal, highly incorporeal, and devoted life. In their abhorrence of the concrete, they sacrificed all that was corporeal and social in revelation to a spiritualistic separatism, which is always skilful in exhibiting isolated breathings and ideas of the divine life in special dedications and exercises, but can never attain to the dedication of the whole actual life, because it is its property to condemn the universality of revelation in the popular Church of God. The first of these sects ruled, according to their own peculiar notions, over the superstition of the nation, and its external worship; the second, as a cowardly element of scepticism, manifested both in the opinions and by the reserve of the upper classes, pervaded the theocratic government with dismal effect; the third lived in voluntary excommunication, which it sought to palliate by a pacifying demeanour towards the sacred rites of the people. It is quite in accordance with the character of these sects, that the Pharisees should especially urge on the crucifixion of Christ, that the Sadducees should seek to suppress the announcement of His resurrection; while the Essenes kept as far aloof from the scene and events of Christ's life as if they had not existed, on which account they are never met with as active agents in the Gospel narrative.

The corrupt pietism of Israel was quite prepared, under these three forms, to misconceive the true glory of Israel, the Messiah, and either to reject Him or expose Him to the heathen, nay, to deliver Him up to the jurisdiction of the heathen world.

The maturity of heathen corruption is evidenced by the fact, that the Romish power was capable, at the instance of Jewish fanaticism, of perpetrating, under the forms of their prond and perfected administration of justice, that great 'judicial murder' against the person of Christ. Pilate, the powerful representative of the Roman Emperor and of the civilisation of his universal dominion, suffers himself to bend, to crack, to break, in his three-fold capacity of ruler, judge, and philosopher, before the storm of Jewish fanaticism. The power of the Roman eagle becomes subservient to the fury of a conquered and hated people; the venerable and exalted Roman Forum passes sentence of death upon acknowledged innocence; the aristocratic and ironical

philosopher, who penetrates the motives of Christ's enemies, and smiles at His doctrine as an inoffensive and harmless enthusiasm, lowers himself through fear of the people into the executioner of fanaticism. Pilate, however, does not thus stand before us merely as an individual, he represents the secular spirit of his times ; and his soldiers, by their active co-operation in the crucifixion, express the savage temper of those legions which conquered and governed the world. Thus an alliance of hierarchy, despotism, and revolution, the latter being represented by the Jewish people, together with an alliance of superstition and unbelief in the Pharisees and Sadducees, took place at the crucifixion of Christ, in which the union of the world in its enmity against Christ, was announced in a world-famed and decisive incident. As however that world of light which is opposed to this world of darkness, manifests its life in its contrasted positive and negative poles, so do we perceive in this alliance also, the contrast of positive Jewish hatred, and negative heathen irresolution, through whose union that condemnation of Christ, which condemned the whole world, took place.

Since, however, in Christ perfect love exists in presence of the world's complete banded hatred, a struggle necessarily ensues, in which love is outwardly subdued, but inwardly victorious. The world is condemned while it is saved ; its entire ruin is evidenced in the fact it accomplishes ; it rejects its own honour, its glory, by rejecting Christ. Thus it is outdone and convicted by the justice of God ; it loses its right to live and to boast of eternal righteousness. But the same world is saved while it is condemned ; this its extremity of guilt renders its need of salvation complete, and its salvation is perfected by the victory of love in its innocent faithful Head and Saviour. The victory of Christ's love over the world's enmity is the victory of God's grace over the curse.

Thus did Christ enter the midst of the world and of time, and lay the foundation of a new æon surpassing the old time, or rather He founded this new æon upon the old time. The reception of His Gospel is the beginning of eternal (æonian) life, its rejection the beginning of eternal misery. Hence the forces which concurred in bringing about the holy catastrophe of the Gospel are continually reappearing in the great constellations of the world's history ; the same forms, the same contrasts, in ever-

increasing approaches to universality and maturity, till at length the perfect universality of the last struggle between light and darkness, cannot but introduce the end of the world's career.

NOTES.

1. The Cross of Christ symbolically denotes the central point of this world and of time, towards which all the contrasts of the world converge, to terminate the ancient forms of their agency and to develop themselves again under new ones. The world confronts the one Christ as a concentrated unity; the Jews and the Romans, the representatives of all religious and secular culture, all ranks and conditions, hierarchy, monarchy, democracy, were united in the coalition which perpetrated the crucifixion, as well as all human sins, all the bad passions of mankind, and all unclean spirits. This contrast—Christ in the power of light, the world under the power of darkness—expresses indeed the mightiest struggle, the most decided dualism. The true unity, however, which this incident produced, is that of the providential government of God and the heart of Christ,—the providential government of God, which, by the doom of crucifixion, brought to perfection, in the very heat of the battle, the redeeming work of Christ, and the need of redemption on the part of man; the heart of Christ, in which love, as infinite love to the world, endured with infinite compassion the world's condemnation, and as infinite love to the Father, welcomed and grasped in this sentence both deliverance and reconciliation. But out of this unity arises a new contrast; the Crucified One, who gives Himself to the believing world as its Saviour, is to the unbelieving world a sign of condemnation. In this great event are seen all the great powers of the world in their most powerful state of excitement. Israel is divided into the crucifying people, and the crucified Lord. Israel delivers Christ to the heathen. The whole world crucifies Him; hence it appears as a world subdued by Heathenism. The true Israel, in its concentration and perfection in Christ alone, opposes it; for the Jews who crucified Him were then, in a theocratic sense, heathens and nothing else; nay, the last and worst among the heathen, since they had thus cast away their Israelite glory. The heathen, however, were no longer mere heathen, after Christ had been delivered up, and had delivered Himself up, to them by the sur-

render of love. The receptive among them now formed a unity together with the receptive of Israel; nay, it was they who formed the majority of these receptive ones, and consequently formed also, by their reception of Christ, the people of His possession. Thus the parts played by Israel and the Gentiles in the world's history were changed; the poles changed places with each other under the influence of the great storm—the first became last. This effect of the Cross expresses, on one side, the infinitely delicate interworking of all relations in the history of the world, and between heaven and earth; on the other, the infinite intelligence of the overruling divine mind amidst the interworking of all these relations.

2. It is a defective view of the Jewish sects, to describe the Pharisees alone as the self-righteous among them, since they rather did but exhibit one special kind of self-righteousness, viz., the casuistic, while the Sadducees were guilty of rationalistic, and the Essenes of spiritualistic, ascetic self-righteousness. In this respect the names of the several sects are significant. The name of the Pharisees, פְּרִישִׁין, is derived by Suidas from פָּרַשׁ in the sense of *to separate, to distinguish*, so that the Pharisees represent those who were distinguished from the other Jews by their holiness—set apart, pious ones (see Winer, *R. W. B.* ii. 290). But the title would, in this sense, be far more applicable to the Essenes than to the Pharisees, who lived specially among the people. If, however, we consider the general meaning of Pharisaism, we find that it exhibits exactly that bitter separatism in which corrupt Judaism appeared in the presence of Heathenism, and in its separation therefrom. Thus the Pharisees were, with respect to the heathen, those complete separatists which the Jews in general are said to have been, according to the assumption of rationalism, but which, as merely Israelites, they certainly were not. 'This tendency,' says Winer, 'was probably first impressed upon them after the restoration of the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine (in the time of Ezra), and is properly the characteristic of exclusive Judaism, as distinguished from Hebraism. This disposition very naturally evoked another, viz., Sadduceeism. But certainly neither formed sects, properly so called, in an ecclesiastical or political sense, before the period of the native Jewish princes (the Maccabees). The effect of this pharisaic effort in presence of the heathen world was manifest,

not only in the behaviour observed toward the heathen themselves, but also toward those who seemed to be infected by their blood and spirit, toward Samaritans and publicans. (Comp. Josephus, *Antiq.* xvii. 2, 4 and xviii. 1.) It may be questioned whether the word Pharisee may not be referred to act. Part. פֹּרִישׁ, as others have conceived; the word פָּרַשׁ meaning actual separation, strict severance, subtle distinction. This expresses the relation in which the Pharisees stood to the law: they explained it as discriminating casuists, developing their precepts and observances from it. In any case, the Pharisees were self-righteous, or, to define them more clearly, observers of traditions and rites. The Sadducees also made pretensions to legal righteousness. Epiphanius (*hæres.* i. 14) derives their name from the fact that they thus named themselves from a notion of possessing a righteousness corresponding to their view of the law (the law in its mutilation). If, however, the word cannot be directly derived from צַדִּיק (righteous), but must first be referred to a *nomen proprium*, צִדְקָה,¹ yet the relation between this noun and the adjective צַדִּיק is unmistakeable, and must have been significant to a sect which boasted of fulfilling a pure and sharply defined law. The Sadducees, then, were self-righteous in the sense of obedience to a revealed duty—rationalists seeking righteousness in duty. The Essenes, finally, sought to be righteous in the sense of entire severance from the common and profane, in virtue of strict devotedness, renunciation, and religious exercises, nay, even of inward devotedness. This pretension is evidenced in their whole mode of life, and expressed by their name, which is a mutilation of הַקְּדוּשָׁה (ἁγιοι), the pious, the holy, and at all events denotes an internal as well as an external piety. Even this common characteristic of pretensions to holiness, expresses the alienation of these tendencies from Christianity. With respect to the Old Testament, however, they represent three separate kinds of corruption. The principle of outward piety which ani-

¹ According to the explanation by which the Rabbis derived the word from Sadoc, a founder of this sect, who is said to have been a disciple of Antigonus Socho, whose instructor, Simeon the Just, lived in the time of Alexander the Great. [Antigonus was president of the Sanhedrim 300–260 years before Christ, and taught that God was to be served out of pure love, and not from fear of punishment or hope of reward, from which doctrine Sadoc concluded that there was no future world of retribution.—ED.]

mates Pharisaism, poisons religion, and forces it into a wild and rank luxuriance of precepts and observances. The principle of doubt which governs Sadduceeism, not only cuts off prophecy, that noble plant of the theocracy, as a weed, but even kills its roots. The Thorah is to this school only a literal codex; hence it denies that the doctrine of the resurrection is contained therein, just as unspiritual rationalism is unable to discover it in the entire Old Testament. Thus Sadduceeism properly represents a belief in a mutilated revelation; while Essenism, on the other hand, represents an actual alteration of revelation. The relations of rank among its members are opposed to the institution of the Church of God; the legal celibacy of the majority, to the Old Testament consecration of marriage; aversion to anointing with oil, and avoidance of participation in the temple sacrifices (comp. Neander's *Life of Jesus Christ*, p. 40, note), denote a spiritualism which had overstepped connection with the theocracy (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8; Philo, *quod probus liber*). When the youthful education of Christ was formerly attributed to the Essenes, this was a proof that the true relation of this sect to the economy of the kingdom of God was not yet understood. Its morbid spiritualism points to dualistic assumptions, to heathen gnostic elements, especially expressed in its view that the body is the prison of the soul (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 11). Consequently the relations of this tendency explain the fact, that it was idealized by Philo. Even the views of the three parties, respecting the relations between God and man, were one and all unchristological; all that happened being attributed by the Essenes to fate, by the Sadducees to human freedom, by the Pharisees partly to fate, partly to human freedom (Josephus, *Antiq.* xiii. 5, 9, and *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 14). That elements existed in each of these tendencies,—namely, piety in Pharisaism, a struggle for spiritual freedom in Sadduceeism, and the cultivation of the inner life in Essenism,—which in noble minds might lead to an alliance with Christianity, is not denied by what we have advanced.¹

¹ [According to Neander, the Sadducees were less likely to embrace Christianity than either of the other sects. For fuller information on the Jewish sects, see Drusius, *de tribus sectis Judæorum*, which has been incorporated by Triglandius with other works on kindred subjects, and published in two vols. 4to. Delft, 1703.—ED.]

3. When Christ was born, Judea, though dependent upon Rome, had still a king of its own (Herod). When He was crucified, it had already been for some time under the government of the Romans, after the proscription of the ethnarch Archelaus, Pontius Pilate being the sixth governor who ruled over the country. According to ancient theocratic privileges, this subjection would have been but a temporary visitation. The delivering up, however, of Christ to the Gentiles extinguished the ancient theocratic rights of the nation. When the return of Israel to the faith, and their national restoration, are announced in our days, such an event is quite in conformity with the prophetic promise; but when the reinstatement of the nation in its ancient privileges in the kingdom of God is promised, this is entirely opposed, not only to the priesthood of the universal Church of Christ over all nations, but also to the fact that the hereditary theocratic rights of Israel were forfeited by the crucifixion of Christ.

4. On the notion of the æon, compare the work, *Unsere Unsterblichkeit, und der Weg zu derselben*, Kempten, Dannheimer 1836, p. 12. 'Æon or eternity is not that which has no end and no beginning. Æon is nature returning in its vital movement from hidden beginnings to developments also hidden.' — 'Æon is the inward period of development of things, the inward time of things.'

SECTION II.

THE SCENE OF CHRIST'S LIFE, THE PROMISED LAND.

It was not till His crucifixion that Jesus was released from the obligation by which, as the most loyal Israelite, He felt His personal ministry confined to His own people (John x. 16, xii. 32; Matt. xv. 24), though that spiritual fulness and inward freedom with which He lived within the prescribed limits of Israel, made His life a ministry supremely adapted to the wants of the whole world (Matt. xiii. 31; John xii. 23, 24). Hence the great, the essential, and therefore the eternal King of the whole human race, completed His course and His work within

the narrow boundaries of the promised land, the Israelite Canaan.

As the nation of Israel may, according to the compass of its powers and deficiencies, its light and dark sides, be regarded as a concentrated representation of the human race, so may the promised land be designated a symbolical miniature of the whole earth. It represents the essential peculiarities of the earth in the smallest space, and within the smallest frame; hence it has become the beloved, the 'precious' land, the land that speaks to man's heart, the land by which man has learnt to appreciate the beauty of the whole earth. Hence also is it that the Jew, in his exile, finds that the whole earth is his home; while, at the same time, he never feels himself at home anywhere. A grave in the much-longed-for promised land is the object of his utmost desire.

Canaan unites within itself a rich variety of most significant contrasts, by the blending of which is formed that unity, the chosen land, which was destined to be the place of education for the chosen people. As little as Israel, with its theocratic and divine blessings, was destined to isolate itself, with respect to other nations, by a bitter and pharisaic pietism, so little was Canaan shut up from the world. It lay midway between the most polished nations of Asia, Africa, and Europe; landwards, it was either bounded or traversed by the most famous caravan roads; seawards, it was in the neighbourhood of the most frequented sea-passages, and the most noted navigators. Surrounded by numerous nations, in the neighbourhood of the world-blessing Phœnicians, of the world-conquering Assyrians, and of the world-frequented Egyptians; exposed to being involved in all the great catastrophes of the heathen world; the land could not but experience every pulsation of the world's life, nor could its people fail to retain the feeling of the effort in which its destination for the world, the consciousness that its theocratic blessing was destined for the world, was to ripen. Its very position would continually give Israel occasion to appreciate and maintain the power of its faith contrasted with the secular power of Babylon—the light of its Monotheism contrasted with the learning of Egypt—its quiet, happy, festal life contrasted with the splendour of Phœnicia, nay, its own inward worth, its own reality carried to appearance, contrasted with the plastic 'appearance

carried to reality' of the Grecian world.¹ But as Canaan lay, on the one hand, in the neighbourhood of all the powers of the world, so was it, on the other hand, isolated by the peculiarities of its position; and fulfilled thereby its destination to become a retreat for Israel's youthful consciousness, which could only attain its maturity of monotheistic development through the sharp thorns and goads which its attitude of variance towards other nations produced. That measure of divinely ordained, temporary, universal pietism, protected by which Israelitish knowledge of God was to come to maturity, found its corresponding limit in the geographical enclosure of the land: the Lebanon, the Syrian wilderness, the desert boundaries towards Egypt, the neighbourhood of the ever jealous Philistines,—all these limits were a help to the weakness of a people ever alternating between the extremes of a boundless wooing and an equal hatred of the world, while its duty was both to preserve the noble seed of the world's true freedom, and to cherish the most ardent love for the world.² Even the very conformation of the earth on which lay the sacred localities, seemed to share in the destiny of the country. It was such that the country could everywhere be easily fortified. Jerusalem is almost a natural fortification; the coast is protected by noble heights, Gerizim and Tabor seem raised like citadels; even in the lesser features and details in the formation of this glorious land, adaptability to purposes of fortification, and fitness to become the abode of a sacred spirit of kindliness, is everywhere manifested.³ From Lebanon downwards towards Egypt the chalk formation is continued in a series of hills and mountains, which offer rude clefts and mountain fastnesses for the retreat of an oppressed people⁴ (Judg. vi. 2),

¹ In the time of Christ this contact of Israel with the heathen was already fixed in various ways. The Samaritans were of old a mingled people, infected with heathen elements; Galilee, by its neighbourhood to Gentile nations, its mingling with the remnants of Gentile tribes, and by its intercourse with the Gentiles who traversed it upon the great caravan roads, had become 'Galilee of the Gentiles,' according to the strictly Jewish feeling. Jerusalem itself, as a place of pilgrimage to all Jews and proselytes, could not but favour the ever increasing numbers of converted heathen.

² Comp. Bräm, *Beschreibung des h. Landes*, p. 3; *Geographie des Menschen von Fr. v. Rougemont*, tr. by Hugendubel, p. 159.

³ Comp. Plieninger's *Weinachtsblüthen* for 1838, p. 201.

⁴ To the present day the mountainous region of Lebanon has been the

and especially for persecuted prophets (1 Kings xviii. 4) and royal fugitives (1 Sam. xxii.), among which the caves upon Carmel, particularly that attributed to Elijah, as well as David's cave at Adullam, are specially celebrated. Besides this series of white rocks, a vein of black basalt runs through the eastern borders of the country, and indicates the subterranean fire which formed the region, and probably played its part in the earlier theocratic and miraculous history of the people.¹ From north to south, and from east to west, the greatest variety is met with in the conformation of the country. From the tract of coast in the west we ascend to the hill country, with its terrace-like formations, divided into two parts by the deep valley of the Jordan, the eastern hills being bounded by the great desert. From north to south chains of hills run through the country on either side of the Jordan, as if they would bury it in more sacred and silent solitude,² and crown the solitary inheritance of 'the silent one' with heights and peaks, between whose openings are obtained, in some parts, views of the sea, but generally of the distant country. How rich is this country in glorious and charming prospects from hill to hill—southwards from the hills of Naphtali to the hills of Ephraim, and from these to the hills of Judah, but especially between the heights of the eastern and western sides of Jordan! There are regions which address the human spirit, so to speak, in the major tone, *e.g.*, extensive plains or mountain scenery. Others speak in a minor key to the mind. Germany is rich in minor tones. Canaan, however, seems to have a great variety of transitions from one to the other, and yet to possess a strongly marked unity of character. In its eastern resort of free tribes, or of Christian flocks, though they have not been able to deliver themselves from the Mohammedan power.

¹ 'The volcanic nature of the basin of this lake (the Sea of Galilee), and of the surrounding region, is not to be mistaken. The hot springs near Tiberias and at Umkeis, S.E. of the lake, as also the lukewarm springs along its western shore, the frequent and violent earthquakes, and the black basaltic stones which thickly strew the ground, all leave no room for doubt on this point.' Robinson, ii. 416.* S. Crowe, *Geographisch-historische Beschreibung des Landes Palästina*, Pt. i. p. 34.

² 'From our calculations, soon afterwards confirmed by many observers, we unexpectedly found that the plain of Jordan is 528 Parisian feet below the level of the sea.' Schubert's *Reise* iii. 80.

* [All the references in this work to Robinson's *Researches in Palestine* are made to the second edition, London, 1856, 3 vols.—Ed.]

highlands it exhibits the Asiatic characteristic of monotonous vastness; in its western formation of hills and valleys are seen touches of its affinity to Europe;¹ towards the south are reflected Egypt and Africa, in the glaring contrasts it presents of both paradisaic and terrible scenes; towards the north the mountainous district of Lebanon forms the boundary of the land. The white peak of Hermon, seen far through the country, represents the regions of eternal winter; while in the low-lying tracts of the valley of Jordan the palm, the pride of tropical regions, revels in the hot climate of Arabia. How extensive is the scale of climatal contrasts in this land!² And what a happy medium exists in those warm boundaries of the temperate zone, in which it is easiest to man to maintain the due proportion between labour and rest, in which, in the pleasant contrast of their alternation, both light and darkness could be called gifts of God, and looked upon as welcome blessings!² With the pleasant occupations of rural life between seed-time and harvest, was intermixed the romantic feature of nomade life, and the anchorite's freedom from care for supplies was experienced within the sphere of pastoral life; while the domestic comforts of Western life were here met with, on the very boundaries of the desert, and of the torrid zone. The Israelite could often pass both night and day in the open air, but not without experiencing the excitement which man always feels in the romantic wildernesses of the earth. He was surrounded by the kindly sights and sounds of nature;⁴ but the sublime was everywhere the predominating

¹ Fr. von Rougemont, *Geogr. des Menschens* i. 158.

² 'The Arabs say of Lebanon, that winter rests upon its head, spring sports on its shoulders, autumn lies on its lap, and summer slumbers at its feet.'—*Biblische Geographie*, Calw. 1643 (von Barth), p. 3. 'In Jericho the wheat harvest was nearly over by the 14th of May, while here, in Tiberias, it was in about the same state of advance only on the 19th of June.'—Robinson, ii. 388.

³ Isa. ix. 2; Mal. iv. 2; Ps. xvii. 8, xci. 1.

⁴ 'Besides the exotics of the warmer East, willows and poplars, as well as the tamarisk, flourish there; and among the songs of other minstrels of the wood, whose tones are strange to the ear, may be heard the familiar lay of the nightingale.'—Schubert, *Ueber die Gegend von Jericho* (vol. iii. 84). 'The western shore of the northern part of the lake, before and beyond El Medjel (Magdala), is extremely fertile, and covered, down to the water's edge, with corn-fields, interspersed with thickets and trees. It seems to be

element. His country was rich in enjoyments, but exposed to the vicissitudes of great natural catastrophes. The sharp contrast between oasis and desert, between the soil of the aromatic and variegated palm, and the naked, burning, sandy rock of Arabia, is found here; *e.g.*, in the contrasts between the frightful rocky wilderness of Quarantania and the blooming gardens of Jericho,¹ and especially between the fertile borders of the Lake of Galilee and the desert shores of the Dead Sea.² These contrasts point to the delicate and spiritual nature of the country, to its delicate suspension on the line between the blessing and the curse (Deut. xi. 28). Canaan was from the first a country infinitely susceptible of changes of condition, like the people, with which it was to form a sanctuary for God. It lies midway between those great natural extremes, in which the earth seems almost to overpower man, as *e.g.* in the heat and luxuriance of the East Indies, and in the frozen deserts of Greenland. Regions of this kind have either a paralysing or an intoxicating effect upon sinful man, favouring in either case the dreams of sensual life. Canaan, on the contrary, shares the lot of its inhabitants, as if it sympathized in it, as the harp does with the feelings of its player. The reason lies in the changeable and delicate tone of the climate and soil. Both are in the highest degree influenced by vegetation. Vegetation, however, in Canaan presupposes a peaceful, numerous, industrious, and pious people. What is more or less true of the earth in general, is especially so of Canaan—that the country deteriorates and improves with the people³ (Isa. xiii. 11, etc., xxiv., xxx. 23, and other passages).

This country could be changed into a garden, and it was a garden at its best times. The hills of terrace-like form were a favourite haunt of wood-pigeons and turtle-doves: we saw them by hundreds, and heard their cooings.'—*Id.* p. 250.

¹ See Schubert's *Reise in das Morgenland*, vol. iii. pp. 72–77.

² We do not here speak of the regions surrounding these two seas. Ancient prejudices concerning them have been corrected by modern travellers.

³ A fact utterly ignored by those critics who insist on drawing from the barren aspect of Canaan an inference against the truth of the Old Testament, in which the country is everywhere extolled as a land flowing with milk and honey. If, however, according to the accounts of modern travellers, a large laying out of gardens by Ibrahim Pacha could have an influence on the increase of the rain in the neighbouring country of Egypt, it may be supposed to what a degree the similar but certainly more susceptible climate of Canaan was dependent upon the operations of its inhabitants.

often changed into terraces. On these happy hills the joy of harvest was ever resounding; on these pastures the shepherd was ever rejoicing. But when Israel forsook God, they became the prey of the nations whose gods they worshipped. The good land was trodden down, and became a road for the enemy, disgraced, stripped of its foliage, and converted into a sun-burnt stony field, neglected, and in its desolation often overgrown with thorns. The varying soil of the human heart, the bad reception given by many to the seed of the divine word, was reflected in the desolation of the land (Matt. xiii. 3).

The Old Testament must be read to perceive how easily the country influenced its people, how well the people understood their country. This land is related to the highest problems and destinies of humanity; there is a constant interaction between the countenance of man and the face of the country. This theocratic and poetic consecration of the wells and springs, of the caves and hills of Israel—the gleams of the blessing, the shadows of the curse, which are interwoven into the whole country, but especially the perpetual fragrance of that christological consecration which hovers over the summits of the hills surrounding the Sea of Galilee, and of the Mount of Olives,—every part of the Holy Land is an enduring testimony to the fact, that in Israel human nature was awakened and developed, in interaction with the promised land, to that state of mind which understands the ideal nature of the earth, its deep harmony with mankind.

Canaan received its highest consecration from the journeyings of Christ. As the loyal Israelite, dwelling first at Nazareth and then at Capernaum, Christ had to make the customary journeyings to the sacred feasts at Jerusalem. As their Rabbi, He shared in the movements of His disciples; as His Father's messenger, He followed the call of need, the track of reciprocity, the paths of the poor, the ways of the sheep that had no shepherd, the movements of inimical and repelling antipathies and of sympathizing agencies;—alternately yielding to the want felt by His exalted nature for silent communion with His Father, and to the desire and duty of appearing in the theocratic centre of His nation. Thus out of the narrowly restricted path of His Israelitish pilgrimage, was formed the far-reaching, much-embracing path of His journeyings. He went about doing good. He transformed the rugged path of constant temple-service into a happy pilgrimage

of free and rejoicing love. His time was spent between worship in the great temple of creation, in which He was alone with His Father, especially upon the heights on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, and worship in the symbolic temple of His nation. In this journeying life He exhibited the union existing between an unfettered wandering life, passed amidst the scenes of nature and the absence of artificial wants, and the restricted life of that high degree of civilisation which floats before the mind of Christian man as his exalted destiny. He revealed the rich inheritance of the believer who has not where to lay his head, but who, whether on the stormy midnight wave, or the burning noon-day journey, can with Him, and through Him, rest on the bosom of the Father, walk in the happy ways of His eternal Spirit, and find His meat and drink in the fulfilment of His will. By His birth, the cheerful pasture-fields of Bethlehem became fields of light, ever basking in the sun of joy. The town of Nazareth is ever the symbol of those obscure corners of the earth, in which many of the kings and princes of the spiritual kingdom, destined to prepare the way of the great Nazarene, have grown up in concealment. The lonely neighbourhood of Nazareth has deep and solitary valleys, covered with the most luxuriant vegetation, and silent retired paths, with rugged, snow-white, rocky walls; holy places, once trodden by the Saviour's feet, and consecrated by His prayers.¹ Christ left Nazareth at the commencement of His public ministry. 'A prophet hath no honour in his native town.' The flame of the truly divine life could indeed be extinguished nowhere, but it would not choose the oppressive atmosphere of antipathy and indifference. Christ settled at Capernaum. This wealthy city, inhabited by publicans, soldiers, and travellers, was the most cosmopolitan dwelling He could have chosen within the limits of Israel's claims upon Him; the centre of that caravan road of Galilee of the Gentiles, through which flowed the traffic between East and West, between Syria and Phœnicia. So near did the large-heartedness of that loving Prince of the whole race lead Him to the door through which He might already send out His welcome to all the world; while, on the other hand, He sought and found amidst the population of the Sea of Galilee, the most genuine Israelites, the most pious and most liberal among the most unprejudiced. It was at Caper-

¹ *Bibl. Geographie*, by Barth, p. 31.

naum and other places on the Lake of Gennesareth that He specially displayed His glory; but they only plunged into deeper darkness, and turned the blessing into a curse.¹ What celestial brightness attends those memories of Jesus which hover over the Sea of Galilee! It was on these declivities,² as also in the miracle of Cana,³ that those *antepasts* of the Lord's Supper took place, in the miraculous feedings of the multitude, in which Christ, for the moment, raised whole multitudes to a heavenly frame of mind. On the farther side of the lake, He enlightened the darkness of the country of the Gergesenes by His presence; on the nearer, He manifested, by the most touching miracles of mercy, the advent of the kingdom of God. It was from one of these mountains that the sermon which represents the way of salvation as a progressive series of blessings,⁴ resounded throughout the world. Upon a mountain Christ manifested Himself to His most confidential disciples, in the brightness of His essential glory.⁵ It was from silent mountains that He often looked with

¹ Matt. xii. 23. Even the names of Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Chorazin have perished. Robinson, ii. 405.

² Matt. xiv.—xv. According to the indications given by Mark, the locality of both the miraculous feedings of the multitude must be sought on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee: Mark vi. and viii.

³ John ii. According to Robinson, Cana was not, as is usually supposed, the village of Kefr Kenna, about a league and a half N.E. of Nazareth, but a town three leagues distant from Nazareth, in a N.N.E. direction, where a ruin called Kana el Jelil is still pointed out.

⁴ 'The Kurun Hattin (horns of Hattin), between Mount Tabor and the Sea of Tiberias, is said by the Latins to have been "the Mount of Beatitudes," the place where the Redeemer delivered the Sermon on the Mount to the multitude standing on the adjacent plain. There is nothing in the form or circumstances of the hill itself to contradict this supposition; but the sacred writers do not specify any particular height by name, and there are in the vicinity of the lake perhaps a dozen other mountains which would answer just as well to the circumstances of the history.'—Robinson, ii. 371.

⁵ 'The context of the narrative seems to imply, as has been shown by Lightfoot and Reland, that the Mount of Transfiguration is rather to be sought somewhere around the northern part of the lake, not very far from Cesarea Philippi, where there are certainly mountains enough. But a circumstance which these writers overlooked, and which puts Mount Tabor entirely out of the question, is the fact above substantiated, that long before and after the event of the transfiguration, the summit of Tabor was occupied by a fortified city.'—Robinson, ii. 359. 'Its wonderfully beautiful and regular form, and isolated position, caused it from very early times to be regarded by Christian tradition as the Mount of Transfiguration. I cannot,

secret grief, but also with the saving pity of a divinely ordained Redeemer, upon deluded Israel, whom He saw as exiled and cast out from their inheritance, and upon His pleasant land, and His unhappy people. With what emotion of heart did He sit upon the Mount of Olives, and behold in spirit the destruction of the temple and the ruin of the nation! He foresaw that His own fate must be met at Jerusalem, yet He wept over the city! He died before her gates, without the camp of the legal Church, outlawed and proscribed, upon the accursed tree. On the Mount of Olives, near to each other, are the two places where the Christian consecration of the earth, its glorification by the deepest woe and the highest ecstasy, took place—Gethsemane and the mountain of the Ascension. The breath of sorrow issuing from Gethsemane hallows the earth as a dark valley of holy suffering, of the terrors of judgment; the spirit of peace and victory issuing from Mount Olivet, makes the whole earth one bright hill of victory, the victory of Christ reaching to heaven. And finally, Golgotha, together with the holy sepulchre, represents the union of these two points, the place of the curse become the place of honour, the region at once of most terrible defeat and most glorious victory, the curse converted into a blessing, the old sad earth into a new and rejoicing world. As we have no certainty of the locality of Paradise, so neither have we of that of Golgotha; the mysterious place has communicated its sacredness to the whole world.

NOTES.

1. The relation between the life of man and the life of nature, is seldom seen in that purely spiritual light expressed in the sacred Scriptures. Man is often represented as the product of the region in which he is found; the influences which he receives therefrom being looked upon as his fate. Or nature is made to hold on her way, independently of the way of error and confusion, or of the heavenly way of man. Then, for a change, the opposite extreme is rushed into, and man is made the un-

however, believe it, since the Saviour had withdrawn to Cesarea Philippi to escape the researches of His enemies in the region of the sources of the Jordan; a fact which makes it probable that one of the hills of Hermon may have been the scene of the transfiguration.'—L. Völter in *Plieninger's Weihnachtsblüthen*, p. 190.

conscious creator and conscious arranger and former of nature. By the first notion, man is made the child, by the latter the father, of nature. The distinction between the Father and the Son is misconceived, when man, who can only fulfil his destination as an instrument of the Son, is made a being equal to the Father. The Pantheist makes pretensions to being the first person in the Godhead. But the relation between individual man and the Son is also misconceived, when the former is made the product of his exterior world. Holy Scripture rightly makes man appear in his union with surrounding nature; it perceives in nature the sphere of man, dependent upon his mind and inclination. The earth stands, falls, and is renewed with man.¹

2. Schubert writes of the shores of the Dead Sea (*Reise in das Morgenland*, vol. iii. 85): 'The shores of the sea are rich in beauty of outline, as sublime as I have anywhere witnessed, and by no means more desolate than those coast regions of the Red Sea at which we touched during our journey; in some districts, especially on the eastern margin, the vegetation of the ravines reaches to the water's edge, and forms itself into thickets, even beyond the mouths of the Jordan.' Of the Sea of Galilee (p. 238): 'The vegetable world about Tiberias, though robbed of almost all its former ornaments, shows that the borders of this lake, if they were but rightly made use of, are capable of becoming a natural hothouse, in which the growths of Egypt, and even of Arabia, would flourish. The date-palm, though seldom met with, flourishes with the same luxuriance as about Akaba and Alexandria.' Further on, Schubert calls the district 'a paradise over whose quiet lake a spirit of heavenly thoughts and memories seems to hover, while the most lovely and sublime of natural scenes is reflected in its waters.' In a bay 'where a warm spring falls into the sea,' he found a 'thicket of flowering oleander,' whose 'rosy glow spread abroad, like a dawn from the deep, over hills and valleys.' Robinson (*Researches in Palestine* ii. 380, etc., vol. iii. p. 499, etc.) expresses himself less favourably of the shores of the Sea of Galilee. 'The lake

¹ [On the reciprocal action of countries and their inhabitants, see Schlegel's *Philosophy of History*, passim; Humboldt's *Cosmos*; and a very interesting little volume by William Miller, *The Plan of History*. On the adaptation of Palestine to its purpose, see Kurtz *On the O. T. Covenant*, vol. i. p. 147, and the works there cited.—ED.]

presents, indeed, a beautiful sheet of limpid water, in a deep depressed basin ; from which the shores rise, in general, steeply, and continuously all around, except where a ravine, or sometimes a deep wady, occasionally interrupts them. The hills are rounded and tame, with little of the picturesque in their form ; they are decked by no shrubs nor forests ; and even the verdure of the grass and herbage, which, at an earlier season of the year, might give them a pleasing aspect, was already gone ; they were now only naked and dreary. Whoever looks here for the magnificence of the Swiss lakes, or the softer beauty of those of England and the United States, will be disappointed. My expectations had not been of that kind ; yet from the romantic character of the scenery around the Dead Sea, and in other parts of Palestine, I certainly had promised myself something more striking.' If, then, we imagine these rounded western heights of the sea-shore in the splendour of their former vegetation, we have the softest and most powerful of minor keys (compare again Schubert, p. 250 ; Robinson, p. 539). The eastern shore is said to rise to a greater elevation, though not into steep rocky walls and rugged forms. 'Among the hills of the eastern shore, one is distinguished for its striking roundness of form ; a plain runs at the foot of this eastern caldron-shaped hill.'—V. Schubert, p. 253. 'On the southern part of this lake, and along its whole eastern coast, the mountain wall may be estimated as elevated 800 or 1000 feet above the water, steep, but not precipitous.'—Robinson, ii. 416.¹

3. The division of Palestine into Judea, Samaria, Galilee, and Perea, which became more and more marked after the captivity, was caused as much by national as by geographical relations. Even before the captivity, Samaria presented a strong contrast to Judea, which was subsequently increased by the fact that the Samaritans represented a people composed of Jews and heathens, with modified religious tendencies, whose temple-service on Mount Gerizim was opposed to the temple-service on Moriah. Galilee also formed a contrast to Judea before the captivity (Isa. viii. 23) ; for here dwelt heathens scattered among Israelites, and no purely Israelitish blood was to be found.

¹ [Those who wish to study the geography of Palestine will find a complete list (' fuller, at the time of its preparation, than any other extant ') of works on the subject in Robinson's *Researches* ii. pp. 533-555.—ED.]

Besides, the popular mind of the Galileans was more related to the popular mind of the heathens who bordered on, or travelled through it, than was that of the Jews. Finally, Judea enjoyed the double advantage of exhibiting the sphere of the temple, properly so called, and the sphere of education. In both these respects it eclipsed Galilee. To this was afterwards added the fresh disadvantage, that it was geographically separated from Judea by the situation of Samaria. Perea, the region east of Jordan, was separated by that river from these three provinces. This district was bounded on the north and east by Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and Gaulonitis. All these districts were included by the Romans under the name of Syria. The Roman general Pompey attained possession of the country by the conquest of Jerusalem, 63 B.C. The fraternal war of the Maccabean princes, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, in which the deep schism between Pharisees and Sadducees bore bloody fruit, had brought him into the country. He made it dependent upon Rome, and united it with Syria; it retained, however, a remnant of independence, in being governed by a prince of its own, the ethnarch Hyrcanus. His favourite, Antipater, however, became, by his own subtilty and the favour of Cæsar, procurator of the country, and left to Hyrcanus the mere shadow of authority. Herod, the son of Antipater, who was at first procurator of Galilee, by the favour of Antony and Octavius, became, on the flight of Antigonus the Maccabee to Rome, king of Judea, B.C. 37. He governed Judea at the time of Christ's birth with a despotism which went on increasing till the close of his life. Augustus divided his dominions among his sons: Archelaus became ethnarch of Judea, Samaria, and Idumea; Herod Antipas became tetrarch of Galilee and Perea; Philip obtained possession of the northern part of the district east of Jordan, Batanea, Trachonitis, Gaulonitis, and Panias. The district of the ten cities, or Decapolis, consisted of separate townships, under the immediate supremacy of the Romans, scattered throughout the land, and inhabited by Greeks and Syrians. All the above-named small Jewish principalities fell one after another entirely under Roman power. This was first the case with Judea and Samaria, after the deposition of Archelaus on account of his tyranny (~~B.C.~~ 6). The country was then placed under the proconsul of Syria, and

governed by procurators. Once more, however, it was for a short time raised to the rank of a kingdom, under the rule of Herod Agrippa. At the commencement of Christ's public ministry, the region east of Jordan was governed by Philip, after whose death (A.D. 35) it was united to the Roman province of Syria. At this time Herod Antipas, the weak, yet cruel despot, who caused the death of John the Baptist, was still ruling over Galilee and Perea. He was banished in the year 39 to Lyons, in Gaul. Herod Agrippa, however, the grandson of Herod, who was living in private life at Rome, had already obtained, through the favour of the Emperor Caligula, the former tetrarchy of Philip, and now Galilee and Perea were also bestowed upon him. To these the Emperor Claudius added also Judea and Samaria; so that the whole Jewish country once more formed a single Jewish kingdom. He died of a disease, with which he was visited at the moment of his greatest self-exaltation (A.D. 44). Palestine was now again united to the Syrian procuratorate; and from this time the country advanced, under the threefold scourge of tyrannical Roman procurators, devastating highway robbers, and fanatic factions, towards its final catastrophe in the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). The region east of Jordan received (A.D. 53) once more an Idumean prince, Herod Agrippa II., who had, at the same time, oversight of the priesthood in Judea. He possessed, besides the tetrarchy of Philip, that of Lysanias also, and bore the title of king. In the Jewish war he united himself to the Romans.

4. The Jews had not suffered the Samaritans to take part in building their second temple (Ezra iv. 1). They had consequently set up their own worship on Mount Gerizim, and a mutual and ever increasing animosity had continually separated them from the Jews. Their religious development, from this time forth, could not but greatly differ in form from that of the Jews; they had nevertheless so maintained that essence of the Jewish faith, the expectation of the Messiah, that, in the time of Christ, it was current even among the most ignorant of the people (John iv.). The supposition that they were of purely heathen descent (see Hengstenberg, *Beiträge zur Einleitung ins A. T.* vol. ii., p. 3, etc.) is certainly opposed by Christ's conduct towards them (John iv. compared with Matt. xv. 24). The reason adduced, viz., that the heathen colonists say (Ezra

iv. 2) to the Jews, Let us build with you, for we seek your God, as ye do, does not prove that there were no Israelite elements among them; it is quite natural that the prevailing and domineering heathen element should speak from its own consciousness. The fact that the people, in cases when the Jews were successful, appealed to their Jewish origin, and, when circumstances were altered, affirmed their Gentile descent, speaks more for their being, indeed, a mingled people than the contrary. That no Israelitish priests were found (2 Kings xvii. 26) among the remnant of Israelites, who gradually came forth from their concealment, and mingled with the colonists, and that the Jews at Jerusalem would not receive the Samaritans into their theocratic national union, for the sake of such a remnant, is but natural. Even in the saying, Matt. x. 5, 6, the Samaritans are not comprised among the Gentiles, but placed midway between Israel and the Gentiles. The disciples, indeed, were to confine their mission to those who had the first title to it, viz., genuine Israelites.

5. In Palestine was found every possible section of Judaism. Next to the Gentiles, living in contact with Jews in the ten cities, were the Samaritans; heathens, who were both by birth and opinion judaized. Next to these were the Galilean Jews, who were more or less tinged with Heathenism. Then the obscure Jews of Perea; and lastly, the genuine Judean Jews, who dispersed themselves from Judea throughout the whole world, and who culminated in the super-Judaism of the Pharisees and the two other sects.

PART II.

THE HISTORY OF THE BIRTH AND CHILDHOOD OF THE LORD JESUS.

SECTION I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

THE remembrance which the Church has preserved, and the testimony she has given to the childhood of the Lord Jesus, form a series of incidents, together displaying, in artless, poetical, and sacred delineation, on one side, the full reality and historic nature; on the other, the perfect ideality, of the individual life of Jesus in its beginnings and earliest events. They form a cycle; they manifest themselves, by the most speaking facts, to belong to the Christology of the childhood of Jesus. This cycle is naturally a circle of most mysterious and tender images, exhibiting the beauties and graces, as well as the terrors of poetry, in the most absolute reality. These images only differ from many of the productions of actual poetry, by surpassing, in their strict conformity to the due proportions of ideal perfection, all that is glaring and enthusiastic in more ordinary poetry, and, at the same time, all the images of the fancy. Their reality has always had the effect of banishing from the centre of Christian doctrine, the mutilated forms of Ebionitism, which cannot believe in the full spiritual glorification of corporeity.

In our days, indeed, the history of Christ's childhood seems to have been almost abandoned to Ebionitism. The practice of removing the ideality of Christ's life to greater and still greater distances from its commencement, has been constantly persevered in. At first, in accordance with the views of the

ancient Ebionites and Socinians, it was not till His baptism that He was allowed to become the Son of God. Then, not till long after His baptism, and after having, as was supposed, first passed through the school of John the Baptist. Again another advance was made, and it was said that it was not till after His death that the image of Christ was produced, as an embellished remembrance of the actual Christ. And, further still, Paul is said to have been the inventor of mature, universal Christianity. A new station is next formed, by the opinion that the perfectly ideal, or, as it is rather thought, idealistic, view of the life of Jesus, given in the pseudo-Gospel of John, did not arise till about the end of the second century. At last, even the present times are passed by, and Christianity is first to become a truth in the times of the coming Spirit. These spouting prophets of a spirit, who is not to kindle but to extinguish the light of the Gospel history, take one step further, and expect, with the Jews, the advent of the Messiah in a new religion. There is now but another advance, the abolition of all religion. Such is the historical progress of Ebionitism.

It is part of the notion of Christianity, that, as the incarnate Word, it should be perfect from its very origin. Christianity is distinctly a new principle, the principle of all improvement, and cannot itself meanwhile need improvement. It is the principle of the identity of the eternal Word and human corporeity, of real and ideal life ; therefore it rejects every attempt to introduce into its origin, that incongruence between 'the ideal and life' which oppresses the ancient æon. It comes forth from the heart of God, as a new and miraculous life : hence a halo of miracles is formed around this central miracle ; the rays of the rising sun.

To whom are we indebted for the history of Christ's childhood ? It is almost unnatural to let this question take the form of a laboured investigation. Mothers are the narrators of the histories of children. It was, undoubtedly Mary who was the evangelist of the youthful history of Jesus, and it is not obscurely that she is pointed out as his authority by Luke (chap. ii. 19). It would be but natural that she should have preserved a written remembrance of what occurred in the house of Zachariah. The colouring, too, of a woman's memory and a woman's view is unmistakeable in the separate features of this history. When it is once ascribed to a female narrator, we feel that the fact, that

‘wise men from the East’ are introduced without further preface, that the taxing of Herod is designated, the taxing of Cæsar Augustus, who was really at the bottom of it, and many other difficulties, are at once explained. Then also we comprehend the indescribable grace, the quiet loveliness and sacredness, of this narrative. That Mary, who at all events survived the pentecostal effusion of the Spirit on the Church of Christ, should have related to that Church the most important incidents of the childhood of Jesus, and that these communications should have been preserved as holy relics, is so simple and natural a supposition, that it would be superfluous to discuss it further.

NOTE.

The chief considerations which have been advanced against the history of Christ’s childhood, proceed from the above-mentioned Ebionite view of the life of Jesus. Having however already refuted this view, we shall not have occasion to enter any further into an explanation of the circumstance, that these communications have been so generally disregarded, in comparison with other portions of the sacred narrative; separate and special difficulties will, however, be treated of in their proper places.

SECTION II.

THE ANGEL GABRIEL.

(Luke i.)

That theocratic energy which was the soul of Israel’s development, that silent process by which God was becoming man, and man becoming the son of God, seemed in the days of Herod the Great, if viewed according to general appearances, to have become almost extinct. But these appearances must have been deceptive. Never was a great and holy energy stunted to death in the midst of its development; and least of all could this most deeply human, this divine-human impulse, which was the energizing principle of the world’s history, which had begun in such reality, evaporate at last into mere ideals

and pictures of life. But it was in entire conformity with the nature of this its sublimest development, that the noble energy should concentrate itself in the secret recesses of the most profound and elect minds of Israel; that it should ripen in such minds into the form of an infinite mourning after God, an unspeakable anticipation and longing; and thus, constituting a state of perfect recipiency, should be waiting in silent expectation for a corresponding divine operation, a new revelation. While the nation in general seemed dying away like the body of an aged man, its glowing life had concentrated itself in the vital recesses of this body, and was there awaiting the hour of its second birth. So great an expectation—an expectation which God Himself had been bringing to maturity, by means of the works He had wrought during so many centuries of the world's history—could not fail of its accomplishment, that positive communication of life which it needed, and of whose advent it was itself a prophecy.

This expectation, though silent and secret, was strained to the very uttermost; hence its fulfilment could not but ensue in such sudden and great manifestations of the power of God, as might be compared to violent storms. It is after a long and anxious pause, on a sultry and stormy day, that the lightning generally appears. At last it darts suddenly forth, its wondrous flames unite heaven and earth, the thunder rolls, and now stroke upon stroke of thunder and lightning follow with no ambiguous purpose—for a new tone is to be given to the atmosphere to refresh the earth.

It was so with that objective divine operation which Zacharias and Mary experienced, when the birth of the forerunner was announced and promised to the former, and of the Lord to the latter.

This great and wonderful operation of God presupposed a matured recipiency in the deepest and noblest minds in Israel. It is in such a state of recipiency that we meet with the venerable priest Zacharias and his wife Elisabeth: they were pious and righteous in the true Israelite sense. Mary appears on the scene as the handmaid of the Lord, the theocratic heroine, ready to surrender her whole life to God, and acquainted, as well as her priestly relatives, with the spiritual nature of Messiah's dignity and kingdom. A similar state of perfect recipiency, in which

the blossom of Israelite desire opened its petals to the sunshine of the new revelation, prevailed among the elect of those days, in general: Simeon and Anna are the representatives of this reciprocity.

Such hearts, however, as were to be capable of welcoming and receiving the highest revelation of grace in its bodily manifestation, had to be prepared not merely by the bestowal of noble dispositions, but by their development—not merely in the school of Israelite doctrine, but of Israelite experience. They had to be thoroughly unhappy in the truest sense, to be brought to despair of the goodness of the old exterior world, and to experience, in the annihilation of their former ideals, the judgment of God upon its sinfulness, in which they also saw its misery and sadness. Thus alone could they have given up those false notions of a Messiah which were the ruin of their nation; thus alone have known the happiness of receiving, with a poverty of spirit deep as their knowledge of the world, the Prince of the heavenly kingdom, who was to change judgment into salvation, and to build up a new world upon the ruins of the old.

The great sorrow of Zacharias and Elisabeth is known. They had no son. A threefold deprivation, since, under the Old Testament, piety had the promise of an earthly blessing, since the solitariness of their life in the hill country would make the time of advanced age the more gloomy, and since they would not behold the delight, the glory of Israel, which in their longing hearts would be naturally blended with the form of the child which was denied to them. The sorrow of Anna is equally manifest. It was as a widow that she took up her abode in the temple, after the death of her husband. The happiness of her life seems to have been buried with him. The aged Simeon was a theocratic Jeremiah, whom his sorrow for Israel, his ardent longing for the Messiah, had made a wandering Jew in a nobler sense. He was not to die till he had seen the Messiah. He must have breathed forth a long last sigh when he uttered the words, 'This child is set for the fall of many in Israel.' He had penetrated the hypocritical nature of most of the fathers and leaders of the nation; but he was also acquainted with the ardent desires of those who were quiet in the land, who were to rise again through the Messiah. The sword had entered into his own soul, or he would not have been able to announce a

similar lot to Mary. But what was the school of misfortune Mary could have passed through before she received the annunciation? Certainly, mere talents, noble qualities of mind, a childhood filled with pious anticipations, heartfelt maidenly participation in Israel's prayer for the advent of Messiah, enhanced by the proud yet sad consciousness of a descent from David concealed from the world, do not suffice to explain the secret of Mary's preparedness to receive the wonderful communication of the New Testament life, in the strength and fulness of its incarnation. As a Jewess, she *must* have given up the Old Israelite world, *must* have been brought to bury her old ideals by some judgment of the Lord. At all events, this complete renunciation of the world must have been developed during the progress of some great visitation which she had experienced. But in what did her sorrow consist? Had she not borne it with holy womanliness, and concealed it under an 'anointed face'? She seems to have been early betrothed to Joseph, according to Israelite law and custom. Perhaps she had been entrusted, as an orphan, to the protecting care of her older relation. But when the rich qualities of her glorious mind had attained to the maturity of maidenhood; when her freer and greater spirit, which was all unconsciously approaching to the New Testament standard, awoke within her, with all its wants; she then became conscious of the grave nature of this tie. Joseph did not understand her, in her deepest experiences. She was increasingly feeling the sad condition of the house of David and of Israel, which was so secretly forming into a judgment upon the inner life of her solitary heart. But, like a true daughter of Israel, she anointed her face; from the burnt sacrifice in which she offered up her first dreams of life and of the world to the great Israelite duty of legal obedience, she came forth as the virgin, in whom the new world was to have its beginning, the promise of the Redeemer to work with divine creative power, in whose womb the Gospel could assume flesh and blood.

Zacharias and Mary may be regarded as pre-eminently the mature fruits of the tree of Old Testament discipline and education. Divine illumination and divine chastisement had sanctified them, and led them to the very entrance of that Holy of Holies, where they might receive the announcement of the New Testament revelation of God.

The theocratic operation which, according to God's righteous arrangement, such a disposition as theirs could not fail to experience, was naturally the last and highest manifestation of the Old Testament agency of God; of the power of God energizing towards its redeeming incarnation.

When, under the Old Covenant, God revealed Himself to the elect of Israel, these revelations were ever made with reference to His last and highest revelation, His manifestation in the God-man. They were the beginnings of His incarnation. Hence these divine operations always took a human form, in the prophetic ecstasy of those hearts that were visited, in the plastic power of their intuition, and especially when their vision attained the highest degree of intensity. The Son of man who was ever in the bosom of the Father as the coming One, or the Son of God who was ever in the heart of man as the desired One, appeared as present to the spiritually illumined, inwardly perceptive vision of the holy seers. This was the angel of God's presence; the eternal Man in the self-contemplation of God, the God-man about to become such in the ardent desires of Israel's life, the non-temporal Christ ever present by the Spirit to the minds of the prophets. Hence He is identified with Jehovah, as well as distinguished from Him.¹

The high communication in which God finally stilled the universal struggle between His super-mundane concealment, and matured human desire for Him, resulted in two great manifestations of His miraculous agency, an agency at once theocratic

¹ This angel was Jehovah Himself, so far as he was His manifestation, so far as he was the plastic image of His coming; but he was the angel of the Lord, so far as subjective contemplation clothed him with symbolical elements. He was more than any other actual angel, because he was Christ. He was not, however, the already incarnate Christ, but Christ on the road to His incarnation, as He preliminarily assumed flesh and blood in the plastic contemplations of the prophets. Comp. Gen. xviii., Gen. xxxii. 24, Exod. xxiii. 20, 21, and xxxiii. 14, Mal. iii. 1. In the latter passage, this angel appears as the Angel of the covenant, that is, of the interaction between Jehovah and Israel. [According to Hengstenberg (*Christology* iv. 306, etc.), there are four opinions regarding this angel: 1. that he is a created angel employed to act in the name of God; 2. that he is a natural phenomenon or visible sign, by which Jehovah made His presence known; 3. that he is not a person distinct from Jehovah, but only a form of His manifestation; and 4. (which is maintained by the great majority of trustworthy theologians) that he is the Logos of John.—ED.]

and gracious. The first preliminary communication was made to Zacharias. It was a creative agency, which in its revivifying action prepared the life of John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ. The second and more glorious communication was made to Mary. It deposited in her soul, in the soul of her organism, the germ of the incarnation of Christ.

Both these elect vessels received this communication in an ecstasy, in which the creative power of God, as a gracious power, manifested itself to them under the form of an angel, and in which the interaction which took place between their minds, and the divine power which came upon them, caused them distinctly to recognise in this divine power the word of revelation, and formed itself into a dialogue with the angel. They trembled before the power of this manifestation, in which the word of God flowed into their souls as a creative power. They called the angel who brought them the word which laid in them the foundation of a new æon, according to the power of his word, Gabriel, the man of God, the hero of God.

This angel of the presence, whom many in Israel had seen under various circumstances, was called Raphael in the sphere of popular life, when bringing deliverance or assistance to the necessities of the individual. But when to the view of the inspired he presented himself personally as the creative announcer of the kingdom of heaven, of the new æon of the world, he was called Gabriel. When, finally, he appeared before them as the victor over the old æon, as the destroyer of the kingdom of the old serpent, he was called Michael. It is always the same christological operation, the one image of Christ; but this one image in ever varying relations; the angel of the presence developing his different modes of operation.¹ After what has already been

¹ The identity of the angel Gabriel with the angel of the presence appears from a comparison of the following passages. According to Dan. vii. 13, Daniel had a vision, evidently a vision of the Messiah (comp. Havernick's *Commentar*, p. 243); he was like a son of man. According to chap. viii. 15, a vision stands before him like a man (פְּמֹרֶאֱה נָבִיר); this vision is afterwards, ver. 16, called Gabriel (גַּבְרִיאֵל the man of God, the hero of God). While this angel is talking with him, the prophet falls fainting to the earth. But the angel touches him, and lifts him up again. The appearance of Christ in His glory has exactly the same effect upon the Apostle John, according to Rev. i. 17. As long as Christ only appears to sinful man, His appearance as the concrete judgment of God strikes him to the earth; but

said, it might seem to some superfluous to notice in this place the general objections made to the biblical doctrine of angels. Our view, however, of the angel Gabriel would be very erroneously judged, if regarded as antagonistic to the objectivity of the angelic world. Hence it will be necessary, for its further confirmation, that it should be stated in connection with the general doctrine of angels.

The doctrine of angels is derived first from the testimony of theocratic spirits, of elect individuals. They saw visions ; and inquiry must first concern itself with their testimony. When the narratives of such visions are declared to be myths because they relate this miraculous occurrence, a vision, criticism is entirely overthrown. In the zeal of negation, it is overlooked that it is only the vision of the narrator which has first to be dealt with. Now, mythology has neither the modesty nor refinement to speak as soon as He touches him, that communication of life takes place, which lifts the condemned sinner up again. In chap. ix. 21, he who appears is called the man Gabriel (*the man* as more definitely the man of God). The mysterious man, chap. x. 5 (אַיִשׁ אֶחָד), appears alone, and in priestly glory, being represented in the same manner as the Messiah is by John, in the Apocalypse chap. i. 13. To reassure the terror-stricken prophet, he takes the ordinary form of a son of Adam (בְּרִמּוֹת בְּנֵי אָדָם). He distinguishes the archangel Michael (vers. 13 and 24) from himself. For as the theocratic judgments were to further the theocratic revelations, Michael was to come to the assistance of Gabriel. The archangel Michael (מִיכָאֵל who is like God?) executes the judgments of God (comp. Dan. xii. 1, 1 Thess. iv. 16, Jude ver. 9, Rev. xii. 7, 8). But as the angel of the presence is not quite identical with Christ as He appeared, but rather with Christ as about to appear, so also is it especially with the two forms into which the angel of the covenant branches off, Gabriel and Michael ; the former is the world's redeemer *becoming such*, the latter the world's judge *becoming such*, christological presentiments and the approach of divine judgment, giving to the good the preponderance over the evil. When, in the developments of Jewish Rabbism, the unity of the angel of the covenant was lost in various ramifications (Gabriel, Raphael, Michael, Uriel, and others), the misconception of the coming Messiah was already announced ; pure Israelite feeling, however, always recognised the identity of these angelic forms with the angel of the covenant. If the Rationalist will insist upon designating angelic apparitions as illusions, they must then be thus more strictly defined ; they are the illusions of the very elect among mankind, and of their most exalted frames ; they are twin-children with those holiest convictions, which founded the new and Christian world upon those very frames which these illusions gave birth to. They would be illusions of a peculiar kind indeed.

of visions in which the inhabitants of the heavenly world appear. In her world, the vision and the sensuous perception are one and the same; the unearthly beings go about freely, and are seen with earthly eyes, for their world itself is a mythological vision. It is quite otherwise with the appearances of angels in the lives of the saints, though the traditions of some of these narratives in the Old Testament show a tinge of the mythological in their setting.¹ According to the testimony of the theocratic Church, the saints saw visions. These assurances rest upon the same foundation of veracity upon which their inspired testimony to the principles of the heavenly life, which they planted in the earth, depends. The critic has first duly to estimate the difference between the subjective vision and its objective matter, unless he would rashly and hastily cut the Gordian knot with his sword. He must not proceed strictly to test the objectivity of the vision till he has first treated its subjective dignity with reverence.

This remark, that angelic appearances are chiefly found in the form of visions, has not, however, to be set before the critic alone, but also before the orthodox. Never has an angel been seen in the usual direction of the eyes towards the surface of the earth, when the eyes have been in their ordinary sensuous condition. Such a sight seems rather to have depended upon some peculiarity of mind, some special frame, at some great crisis of the world's history, which may be regarded as predisposing to an extraordinary revelation.² As the eye that beholds the sun must be endowed with the sun-gazing capacity, so must there be a spiritual disposition in those who behold spirits, an angelic one in those to whom angels appear.

¹ [This expression must be interpreted by the statements of the author in sec. 5, on the ideality of the Gospel History. In that section he uses the term 'mythological' of whatever glorifies the actual in the ideal, and speaks of a true mythology which saw the coming Redeemer in human persons or in ordinary events. If by *mythological* in the present passage he means, as it must be owned he seems to mean, something less christological and inspired, something merely human and erroneous, then he not only sadly mistakes the difference between Hebrew and heathen mythology, but gives up the very position he himself occupied in the above-mentioned section.—ED.]

² ['It is in accordance with the analogy of history that great manifestations and epochs, designed to satisfy the spiritual wants of ages, should be anticipated by the prophetic yearnings of pure and susceptible hearts, inspired by a secret divine consciousness.' Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 23.—ED.]

This explains the reason, perhaps, why one of the women who visited the tomb saw two angels, when the other perceived but one; why the apostles so suddenly saw angels standing beside them on the Mount of Olives, and other similar circumstances. The capacity for such sight would be different in different men, and in the same man at different moments. It depends upon a frame of mind in which the eye of the body does not stand in its usual opposition to the inner eye, the sight of the heart; in which the polar opposition between the two is annulled, in the unity which is the foundation of both. The eye of the body is, so to speak, plunged into the depths of the heart; the inmost heart has entered into the bodily eye; and thus the visionary and ecstatic man has a glimpse of a world in which the contrast between the internal and external disappears, in which the struggle between heaven and earth is extinct. Such seeing, therefore, is no common perception, but a vision. It is certain that the Bible sometimes speaks of angels with dogmatic certainty (*e.g.*, Heb. ii. 2), and sometimes in a symbolical manner. We must consequently distinguish between symbolical visions of angels, and such statements as agree with the notion of an objective angelic world.

Even symbolical visions of angels are more or less objective, inasmuch as the ecstasy must always be the result of an influence which must be looked upon as a divine operation.

Most numerous are those subjective and symbolical representations of angels, which are found in the history of all times and places. When man receives with delight some great assistance from on high, an angel is present to his mind by means of that plastic power which intuitively thus regards the circumstance. This form is actual in his mind. It is, as formerly remarked, his 'second sight' of Christ. Such angelic appearances must occur under the most varied forms. Indeed, education, and even variety of mental perception, will exert their influence on the forms of these representations of angels, though they are not mere subjective fictions, but the results of a divine influence upon the mind. Of a more important character are those great angelic forms who pass through the world, as spirits of vengeance, of pestilence, of death, or as similar divine messengers, in conjunction with the powers of the elements. They represent the extraordinary visitations of God, exhibiting them in their true character, as mysterious powers proceeding immediately from .

God, and in their highest purpose, as sent with reference to the glory of Christ. Thus coming from God, and thus referring to Christ, even the darkest visitation becomes an angel of light, and solemnizes its symbolic incarnation.¹

But the most exalted operations of God are those in which the communication of His very life are concerned, in which the whole incarnation of Christ is expressed. These appear to the spectator, as has been pointed out above, as the angel of the divine presence. Hence out of one image are developed various images of the archangel. The archangel surpasses the ordinary angelic world as an image and operation of Christ : Christ stands above the angels.

But as operations may become angels in the horizon of the spectators, so also may angels manifest themselves in operations. That Holy Scripture does announce the appearance of actual angels, cannot be denied, nor has anything as yet been advanced antagonistic to this announcement.

Some seek to avoid this question by the remark, that the doctrine of angels belongs neither to the dogmatic nor religious matter of Scripture.² Did then the Scriptures concern themselves to give us information about the physiology of angels? In the end, however, even such a view would not deliver us from this difficult question. Our religious view of life must embrace the whole world; and whether the doctrine of angels is in the Bible or not, we must try to come to a decision about it.³ A multitude of objections to the doctrine of angels has been advanced. We will take these objections in pairs, that is to say, we

¹ He maketh the winds His messengers, the flames of fire His ministers (Ps. civ. 4, German vers.). In His kingdom wind and fire are not abstract phenomena, as they are to the profane observer. The wind is here a body, having a soul, a thought of God, which urges it to fulfil God's purposes; it is this that makes it an angel. The flames of fire are animated, as it were, by the Lord's commission, which they have to fulfil; it is this that makes them the ministers of His majesty.

² Schleiermacher, *der christliche Glaube*, vol. i. p. 204.

³ [Not, however, forgetting the words of Calvin, 'in tota religionis doctrina, tenendam esse unam modestiæ et sobrietatis regulam, ne de rebus obscuris aliud vel loquamur, vel sentiamus, vel scire etiam appetamus quam quod Dei verbo fuerit nobis traditum. . . . Theologo non garriendo aures oblectare, sed vera, certa, utilia docendo, conscientias confirmare propositum est.' And see what he says about the man who speaks as if he had dropped from heaven, and were telling us what he had seen with his eyes. *Instit.* I. xiv. 4.—ED.]

will arrange them in opposing pairs, as casting light upon or abolishing each other. At one time, it is said that God has no local palace in heaven, and keeps no such heavenly court, after the fashion of Oriental princes, as the idea of angels supposes.¹ Then, again, angels are represented as beings existing between two worlds, who, as such, must be lost in the regions of empty space.² The one representation is evidently antagonistic to the other, and they might therefore be left to annihilate each other. We will, however, consider them separately. If the doctrine of Jehovah's heavenly palace were really found in its literal sense in the Old Testament, Judaism would be a kind of Heathenism; and the doctrine of God's omnipresence could not be so decidedly expressed in its view of the world, as *e.g.* in Ps. cxxxix. Every unprejudiced mind must easily perceive that in the light of this doctrine, as well as in the whole teaching of Hebrew Monotheism, such words as relate to the special dwelling-place of God in heaven, must have a symbolical meaning. Let us now consider the angels of the highest heaven, or of the citadel of the universe, as beings existing between the worlds. This view of their peculiarity may perhaps be found in Jean Paul, but not in John or Paul. Holy Scripture knows nothing of this abstract inter-mundanism (comp. 1 Cor. xv. 40, Matt. xxii. 30). Hence, neither the heathen court of angels, nor these modern ethereal angels, are scriptural. The next pair of objections appears in the following form.³ First, it is said angels are incorporeal beings; and an incorporeal being cannot appear. Then it is remarked, that it would be contrary to divine providence, if there were such beings and appearances, since their agency would deprive men of their independence. Therefore an angel is an incorporeal being, and yet again so substantial a one, that he attacks human independence. When, however, the notion of incorporeal individuals is considered by itself, it is evident that a phantom is but produced for the sake of obtruding it upon the Bible. For in the Bible all beings have their proper bodies, conformably to their spheres (1 Cor. xv. 38). This notion,

¹ Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, 4th edit. vol. i. 114.

² Schleiermacher, *der christl. Glaube*, Pt. i. 204.

³ Comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 117. Comp. with respect to the second objection, the work of W. Hoffmann against Strauss, entitled: *das Leben Jesu, etc., geprüft für Theologen und Nichttheologen*, p. 123.

however, could hardly maintain itself in presence of the test furnished by a sound view of the world. For the form of individual personality must be everywhere recognised in creation, as a power which as a speaking monad must, by its very existence, assimilate corporeal matter. But it is said that the existence of angels disturbs human spontaneity. Somewhat in the same manner, perhaps, that moonlight interferes with the regulations for the lighting of the streets. Demoniactal human spirits *seem* most fearfully to interfere with the independence of thousands; yet they actually exist. Angels, on the contrary, only manifest themselves with extreme rarity to the inner man of the receptive spirit, and not without being more or less bidden by his frame of mind. As the muses visit the poet alone, so do the angels visit only the religious and elect. Again, it is at one time said that the Jews brought back a more particular, definite doctrine of angels from the Babylonian captivity, and that the names given to the angels were the result of the influence of the Zend religion.¹ Then it is found strange that the angels, and especially Gabriel, should bear Hebrew names.² It may be conceded that the Jews, under the influence of the Persian doctrine of Amshaspands, did further develop their doctrine of angels. But from the circumstance that these more developed forms of angels bear Hebrew names, and are represented as speaking the Hebrew tongue, it must be allowed that the development in general, is one quite in conformity with Israelite Monotheism. The fact, however, of a fresh development within the theocratic soil being promoted by a heathen influence, is not equivalent to the implantation of a heathen notion, as the critic supposes when he says, ‘Were these notions false as long as they were confined to strangers, and not true until they were transferred to the Jews?’ The Jews always had their own doctrine of angels (comp. Gen. xix.). If this doctrine was developed under foreign influences, this development nevertheless was organically conformable to the organism of Monotheism.³ Its angels could as little be transformed into Amshaspands, genii, or inferior gods,

¹ Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 113.

³ *Id.* p. 114.

² [See Hengstenberg’s *Dissert. on the Genuineness of Daniel*, pp. 127–140 (Clark’s Tr.); Fairbairn’s *Hermeneutical Manual*, p. 203, etc.; and the very able refutation of the rationalist arguments on this point by Mill, *Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels*, pp. 123–135.—ED.]

as the fallen spirit, Satan, could be transformed into Ahrimanes, the evil god. The germ, however, from which they developed their high-enthroned spirits was, as we have seen, the angel of the divine presence. This development may even be regarded as a development of Old Testament Christology, inasmuch as the separate forms of the life of the coming Messiah were therein explained (comp. Isa. xi. 2, Apoc. i. 4). The Israelite had no need to introduce the number seven, from the Amshaspands into this development; for he was already accustomed to discover the fulness of life in the same holy number: to meet with this number elsewhere, could at most incite him thus to represent the forms of the angel of the covenant. The obscuration of Christology first began with the decay of the conviction that visions of the becoming God-man were dogmatically fixed in these angel forms. It was, therefore, not only allowable, but a proceeding which reformed old errors, when the true theocrats of Israel called the glorious manifestation of the becoming Messiah by the name of Gabriel. The theocratic seer thereby testified at once to his sense for the ideal and for history. His sense for the ideal, in giving the angel a name which designated him as an operation. He called the creative operation of grace, in its divine power, the hero of God, because it appeared to him in the divine-human form. His sense for history, because this divine operation was continually reappearing in Israel; it had its rhythm, it repeated and enhanced its manifestations. Therefore the seer who had seen it, fixed it and named it according to his own experience. This name then became a sign to any other who might or who was to experience it. He might be convinced of communion with his fellow-believers even in this experience and recognition. A theocratic Church could not but designate its heavenly experiences, because it experienced the definite progress of God's redeeming purpose in a succession of events, and not a nameless alternation of divine things in physical perpetuity.

The arguments just cited against the doctrine of angels, as little disturb our faith in these heavenly beings, as the prowling of young bears over a sunny meadow would disturb the light fluttering of butterflies over its variegated flowers.¹

¹ [For satisfactory answers to the objection that God is immanent in the world, and therefore needs no angels—'a sensitive concern for the honour of the Supreme,' which Mill thinks is 'somewhat misplaced and superfluous']

Of more importance is the remark, that appearances of angels have become things unheard of in modern times, and thus seem, like ordinary spiritual apparitions, to have vanished before the day-light. It must not, however, be overlooked, that the angels of the old theocracy were only present at special periods, and when new foundations of revelation were to be laid. The modern world is indeed a deeper, broader, and more powerful stream, yet but a stream pursuing its appointed and regular course, an effluence only from the miraculous age of Christ's appearing. The angels who appeared at His grave, opened at once that grave and our æon. This æon is to last till the end of the world. Then shall the angels again appear within the region of humanity (Matt. xiii. 39). But the peculiarity of this Christian æon must also be taken into account. Christ appeared, and believing Christendom attained, by His Spirit, to the perception of His glory. There is now a satisfaction for the christological aspirations of man; the capacity for receiving angelic visions is absorbed in Christian knowledge. In this respect the angels may be compared to the stars of heaven, which disappear before the rising sun, while at noon-day even the full moon seems but a white cloud.

The possibility of the existence of such beings as the angels of Holy Scripture is more and more corroborated by the discoveries of modern science. We see stars of all colours, and of every variety of material condition, traversing infinite space, many of a lightness as ethereal as golden dreams or spectral spheres. The spirits that inhabit them must correspond, in the rapidity and freedom of their powers of motion, to the elf-like nature of their abodes. To those philosophers, indeed, who see in all the starry canopy only 'rocks of light,' uninhabited wastes, the whole world of space is but an Ahriman, a dark world from which spirit is excluded. But if heaven is really inhabited, as we may expect according to the analogy of the earth, it cannot but be regarded as a vast realm of spirits. In this vast realm are found those ministering spirits whose objective existence is certainly assumed when they are spoken of in the Epistle to the Hebrews. But we must delay considering the various kinds of angelic beings till we have first considered the frames of mind

—see Calvin's *Instit.* I. xiv. 11; Sibbes' Works, vi. 320 (Nichol's Ed.); Mill's *Mythical Interpretation*, p. 85; and Ebrard's *Gospel History*, p. 165.—ED.]

which can apprehend them. In the stillness of night we may hear the rushing of the distant stream, which we could not perceive amidst the noises of day; and the light in a distant cottage window is seen to cast its gleam through the whole neighbourhood, while the burning of the whole cottage would scarcely have been noticed by day-light. The roar of Niagara is said to be much better heard at a certain distance than in its immediate vicinity. The same distinctions prevail within the sphere of the inner life. Most minds are incessantly and wholly filled, nay, tied and bound, with the bustle of external events. Their eyes can scarcely fix upon anything merely great or beautiful, which passes them bodily, because they seek the one thing needful in too many things, they suffer from the quest after everything. When, however, this quest after every kind of thing becomes the possessing demon of an age, or even its very worship, we cannot be surprised if that deeply contemplative mood, which believes in the passage of spirits from star to star, from heaven to earth, should disappear. When any one has once taken his position in the mill of world-craving selfishness, and has set all its wheels in motion, he could not hear the fall of Niagara, even if it were close at hand.

But there are souls that have a higher feeling for infinity, because they have the courage to let go those things among the many which are not in conformity with their disposition. They can even, under certain circumstances, welcome the ruin, the end of this world. It is, however, natural that one in whose eyes the world, with its fashions, passes away, should obtain an organ, or rather that the organ should be developed within him, by means of which he looks into the very heavens, and experiences heavenly influences. When the old world perishes, and a new one is expected from heaven, the noblest hearts are, so to speak, vacant, or rather open, for heaven; no longer filled by the old world, which, with its fashions and bustle, is dead to them. In such a condition, they are capable of hearing the voices of spirits, and of beholding the angels of God. It was in such a frame of mind that the women visited the tomb of Jesus; to them all the glory of the world was buried in that grave. Therefore they had an open eye for the messengers of heaven. Thus also was it that the eyes of the disciples were opened on Olivet, when Jesus ascended to heaven. Earth melted into

nothingness when they saw the Lord depart from them ; now, therefore, they were able to perceive the messengers from heaven, and to receive their message.

The beholders of angels become in their ecstasy, as it were, released from the common interests of earth, temporarily 'absent from the body;' and therefore spiritually disposed beings having intercommunion with a higher sphere of life, and that a sphere which bends down towards theirs, as they in spirit rise towards it.¹ But when the spirits of different spheres of life have a common interest, which equally embraces both, they actually meet together in one sphere ; they now operate upon each other, and, when their influences are mutually felt, they are even capable of being personally visible to each other. When the aspirations of Greece invisibly concurred with the missionary impulses of Paul on the sea-coast at Troas, like two approaching flames, then Paul saw in a vision a man of Macedonia standing before him (Acts xvi. 9).² The spirits of Peter and Cornelius so strongly influenced each other, when Peter at Joppa had approached the town of Cesarea, that each was in a vision directed to the other (Acts x.). If these two cases do not exactly express the relation between the spirits of earth and those of a higher world (though in the case of Peter there is at the same time a communication between Christ and himself, and in the case of Cornelius, the communication between him and the objective angel-world cannot be denied),³ yet they are, on the other hand, specially adapted, as examples easily comprehensible, to exemplify the law of visions which we have laid down. The history of the transfiguration, however, presents us with a more difficult and more eminent example. The relative intercourse between the spirits of Moses and Elias, and Christ, draws them into the Lord's sphere of life, when He was about to inaugurate His last journey to His death by His transfiguration ; and by the powerful *rapport* between Jesus and His disciples, they also

¹ 1 Pet. i. 12.

² Formerly they brought the beautiful woman from Troy. Beauty had not satisfied them. Now the Crucified One was to be brought to them from Troas, for their salvation through His word.

³ Mary Magdalene, as released from earth, had an open sense for angels at the grave of Jesus ; but anxiety concerning the body of Jesus, as well as the attraction which the risen Saviour exercised over her mind, resulted in her rising rapidly and wondrously above the angelic appearance.

were partakers of this vision. A contrast to this attraction which takes place between God's heroes from sphere to sphere, causing them spiritually to blend in one sphere, is found in the general *rapport* between angels and children. The peculiar affinity between the moon and the sea is well known; we understand that a somnambulist may be, as it were, possessed by the influence of light of the new moon; it is known that sainfoin celebrates the influence of the sun by a gentle trembling like a passing spirit; we are acquainted with the infinitely far-reaching influences of light, and are inclined, in all these respects, to believe in the most spirit-like influences, even in matter. But when the immeasurably distant influence of spirits upon spirits—it might almost be said, of the most delicate of lights upon the most delicate lights—is spoken of, then common sense stumps in its clumsiest wooden shoes into the midst of the discussion, and dismisses the matter with the cheap remark: Imagination, enthusiastic illusions, or legends. When the full import of the sympathies, of which a faint notion is expressed when the tendencies of this age are allowed to speak out, is scientifically recognised, we shall be forced to acknowledge that the influences of spirits between star and star must be far more powerful than that of starry light, or of any other attracting or repelling forces.

We conclude, then, that when spirits dwelling in different spheres are brought to identity of disposition, when one thought vibrates in them, one interest animates them, they will exert an influence upon each other, and may be sent to one another.¹

But every influence of this kind may become plastic in the mind of the ecstatic. As in photography² a means has been found of fixing and rendering visible the images reflected upon a surface, by objects placed opposite to it; so is an ecstasy

¹ [It is quite possible that there exist many spiritual sympathies and relations with which we are yet unacquainted, but these are surely too uncertain to sustain the foregoing argument. And it is perhaps not very wise of us to invite an adversary into a region which he may term pseudo-scientific, and which may provoke him to taunt us with being driven from the region of ascertained and universally admitted facts.—ED.]

² Mirrors, in general, perform the same office in rendering our thoughts perceptible; but the mirror does not detain the image, while photography renders it permanent. The former more resemble a dream, or passive *mental* clairvoyance, while photography is like the morally free state of ecstasy.

a similar means of detaining certain spiritual influences, and translating them according to their actual import into sight and speech, which in truth they already are, though in a latent manner. Objects are always reflecting their images upon opposite surfaces; but photography alone makes them visible and preserves them. So also are spirits ever influencing spirits, though at great distances; but it is only in the ecstatic state that these influences obtain an actual plastic form.

From what has been advanced, then, it follows that appearances of spirits from other worlds are, under the given conditions, imaginable, when the visionary mind, freed from its own world, receives from the spirit most kindred to itself in another world, an influence which its own plastic agency translates into form, words, and perhaps also into a name; just as the light reflected from one countenance to another is re-formed into a countenance in the eye of the latter.

Since, however, souls are active in their operations, these influences between distances may be regarded as approaches.

The spirits, however, of the subtler regions of the universe, whose corporeity must be almost identical with their operations, as far as their delicacy is concerned, must be able in this organization to hover through the world with a freedom which can scarcely be represented by the most refined of earthly comparisons. The kingdom of God embraces in its development various spheres; as the history of civilisation does various countries. The spirits of education who promote civilisation upon earth are not restrained by the boundaries of nations, they overleap mountains and provinces. It is even so with the spirits of the theocracy; they overpass the barriers of the earthly senses, the limitations of earth. But when the intercourse between them is to become a special influence of heaven upon earth, this ever takes place at a most critical and decisive period pre-ordained by God. It is then that the Lord sends His holy angels.

Holy Scripture speaks of the appearing of angels in the most literal sense. We do not reckon the angel Gabriel among them, not because he is beneath this category, but far above it, as the angel of the divine presence, acting in creative power in the last moments prior to His incarnation.¹

¹ When the older theologians designated the angel of the covenant the uncreated Angel, they thereby declared that he was not an angel in the

NOTE.

Even the most objective angelic apparition is symbolic, inasmuch as the nearest approach of a spirit ever requires the plastic co-operation of the mind of the spectator. The element of the symbolic enters even into love, as existing between man and man. The beloved object is a vision. On the other hand, even the most subjective vision of angels is not purely subjective; it is an objective divine operation coming in the light and power of a christological image from God to man. [Such an objectiveness as this, however, by no means comes up to that which is implied in Scripture; and it is to be regretted that the author has not more distinctly brought out the difference between the objective appearance of the angels themselves, and the objective operation by which the minds of men were prepared for their visits. For while the minds of those to whom they were sent were no doubt most frequently in a state of preparedness, that state of mind was so far from being the cause, that it was not invariably even a requisite condition of the appearance. See, *e.g.*, the case of Sodom. Moreover, if angels appeared in bodies which could partake of earthly nourishment (as they sometimes did), are we not justified in concluding that these bodies were visible to the merely bodily eye? They were not, of course, sent at random, not sent as idlers to hover before those to whom they had no message; but those fit persons to whom they were sent saw them with the bodily organ of vision; and to prove that these persons were generally in an exalted frame of mind, is to prove nothing whatever regarding the objective appearance of what they then saw. The case of Samuel mistaking the voice of the Lord for the voice of Eli is instructive, in showing us the purely objective nature of such phenomena.—ED.]

narrower sense, but more than one; even Christ, appearing as an angel, prior to His incarnation.

SECTION III.

ZACHARIAS.

(Luke i.)

It is a mark of the refined consistency of the theocratic spirit, that the invisibly impending event of the incarnation of God should first have been announced within the sanctuary of the Jewish temple; that the Jewish priesthood, in the person of one of its holiest members, and during the performance of one of its sacred functions, should first have been admitted to the knowledge of this great and germinating mystery. After the long silence of the prophetic Spirit, an aged priest was destined to be the first who was again to proclaim the prophetic Gospel of the coming Messiah, and a priest's son was appointed to close the long series of Messianic prophets, as the immediate forerunner of Christ. The temple seems, indeed, at this time to have been almost entirely occupied by a dead and hypocritical priesthood; but the Spirit of revelation knew how to find the healthy member of the diseased body. The divine communication which Zacharias received in the temple, was indeed like a whisper from the pure Spirit of revelation, shunning the false audience of a priesthood plunged in a debased fanaticism. He was, moreover, obliged to carry it in silence, like a secret treasure, to the solitude of his home, to secure it from the profanation of the other priests of his order. The theocracy could not but honour the temple, the hour of prayer, and the true priest, now that it was about to form the eternal and true sanctuary in presence of the symbolical one. Even the angel of the divine presence went thither, and showed Himself to the priest, when He was about to put on human nature.

We have already spoken of the state of mind which made Zacharias susceptible of the divine revelation. In the melancholy resignation of painfully felt childlessness, he had left his home,¹ with his fellow-priests of the course of Abia, to perform

¹ In Luke i. 39 this is called a town of Judah. According to the opinion of many, the town of Jutta, mentioned Josh. xv. 55 and xxi. 16, according to others, Hebron is intended. Nothing can be said with certainty in

the services of the temple during his week of office.¹ By the casting of the lot, the office of burning incense fell to him. It would be impossible for Zacharias to offer this great sign of the united prayer of Israel, without bringing before the Lord the concerns of His people. Hence his soul had undoubtedly attained to a fervency of theocratic prayer for Israel at the conclusion of this symbolical act, and he was about to leave the temple, when the wondrous power of Jehovah's covenant grace was manifested to him in the appearance of the angel Gabriel.²

Undoubtedly the ideal Zion and his domestic ideal had been a thousand times already blended in his contemplations. Hence the promise that it should be fulfilled was now blended with the promise of a son in the message of the angel.

The angel stood at the right hand of the altar of incense, a good omen for Zacharias. But he was terrified; the revelation found corners as yet unenlightened, and remains of unmelted obstinacy and unextinguished bitterness in his soul, although in the depths of his heart there was a living agreement therewith, his life was radically conformed to it. Hence his individuality stands out. His wife Elisabeth was to bear him a son. He was to be called John, the gracious gift of God;³ he was to be a messenger of God's favour to his father, and a cause of joy to many. His life was to be great; and he was to be sanctified favour of its being Hebron. If the capital of Judea were thus designated (in which case, however, the article would be wanted), Bethlehem might even then compete with Hebron. Since, however, the designation, 'a town of Judah,' would be equally striking if applied to so large a town, the conjecture which many have expressed, that the Evangelist thus modified the original expression 'to the town of Jutta,' because he was probably unacquainted with the town, seems allowable. Jutta is in the hill country south of Hebron. [Hebron has been adopted by many on account of its being one of the most notable of the cities of the priests. The claims of Ain Karim are advanced by Thomson (*Land and Book*, p. 664, ed. 1863), but on no other ground than tradition and a general agreement with the requirements of the narrative.—ED.]

¹ The four and twenty classes of priests performed the service of the temple each for a week, according to an appointed succession. The several functions were apportioned by lot.

² When De Wette remarks (*Erklär. des Luk.*, etc., p. 10), that the angel did not appear to Zacharias 'in an ecstasy,' we must recall what has already been said about visions of angels.

³ John, Jehochanan, יהוחנן, from יהוה, and חנן to be favourable to any one, to have mercy upon him, to present him with a gift.

from his mother's womb through the holy dispositions of his parents, sanctified by the Holy Ghost. Hence his development would proceed without great deviations in the direct line of the unfolding of the divine light in his life. It was, however, to be protected by the ordinance of the Nazarite;¹ he was to pass his life in the abstinence of one vowed to God. This promised one was to turn many of the children of Israel to the Lord their God. He was to go before the face of the Lord, according to the promise of Malachi (iii. 1), in the spirit and power of Elias, to make ready a prepared people. But in what manner? By turning, on one hand, the hearts of the fathers (of the better Pharisees perhaps) to the children, thus making a way for the divine stranger by opposing the traditions of the fathers; on the other hand, by turning the unbelieving (the better among the Sadducees) to the true wisdom of the just.

But how could Zacharias mistrust and contradict the word of the angel, whose message thus met his heart's deepest aspirations? At such moments, when the bestowal of a long-wished-for blessing, whose want he thought he had long ago got over, is announced to one who is resigned to God's dealings, and is declared to be now nigh at hand, all the sensibility of his soul is expressed in a sudden reaction. The peace of resignation has become so dear to him. He has felt himself so secure, so free, and proud in that deprivation which he has accepted from the hand of God as his lot in life, and he is unwilling to be thrown back into his former conflicts. Hence it generally happens that there is a remnant of bitter reminiscence still unexterminated in the depths of the heart. He had once felt himself injured by Providence, but he was constrained by his submission to God to oppose, to condemn, to deaden such a feeling. But now, amidst

¹ The Nazarite is properly the priestly prophet, one who represents his non-legal, free, sacred disposition or vocation to a certain priestliness by self-denial. As symbolical holiness in general was negatively a severance from the community, positively a consecration to Jehovah, so especially was that of the Nazarite. There were both male and female Nazarites. They abstained from wine, and all that came from the vine, and allowed the hair of their heads to grow. As the priest appears as a consecrated man at the summit of social life, so does the Nazarite appear as a consecrated one in a return to the heights of primitive life, or in the original vigour of natural life, which is a special means of nearness to God for one who has a message from God in his heart.

the surprising announcement, the smothered flame of his displeasure bursts forth once more. His various emotions produce a strong passion, a convulsive effort of mind, which seems to repel the promise. Thus did Abraham make objections, when Isaac was promised him; and Moses seemed no longer gladly willing, when he was at length commissioned to realize his youth's highest ideal, and to redeem Israel. Zacharias too manifests a similar emotion.

He had indeed reason to ask, How shall this be? for 'I am an old man, and my wife well stricken in years.'

But instead of an explanation, he requests a fresh sign. 'Whereby shall I know this?'—the vision seeming to him an insufficient sign.¹

The same divine operation now makes a second and more powerful impression upon him.

His doubts are overpowered by the majesty of the divine vision, which appeared to him in a still clearer light. He now recognises in this appearance the angel Gabriel, who stands before God (therefore the angel of the divine presence); and the reproof which thrills through his soul, for his mistrust of such a revelation, affects his whole being.

But it is asked, how could the angel inflict upon him the affliction of dumbness as a punishment to his unbelief? Was not this such a manifestation of passion, it is asked, as should not be supposed to exist in an angelic breast? And was not such treatment unjust, when compared with that which Mary and which Abraham experienced on similar occasions?²

We must first remember that here, as everywhere in the province of revelation, we have to do with facts, whose intention and exact significance is to be known by their results. In the present case, the fact was as follows: Zacharias became dumb as the result of the shock which the vision produced in his mind, and did not regain his speech till John had been born and received his name. He himself recognised in this fact the punishment of his sin; since, without the co-operation of his conscience, he would not have understood the word of the angel, which announced this chastisement.

¹ [Riggenbach (*Vorlesungen*, p. 164) says, 'Like the fleshly Jews he seeks a sign—and a sign is given him.'—ED.]

² See Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, 4th edit. p. 115.

There was also a difference between the expressions of Mary and Abraham and those of Zacharias. He found the sign, which was to be to him the pledge that the wondrous promise would be fulfilled, too small. But even if he had expressed himself exactly as Abraham did, the assertion of critics, that he ought then to experience treatment in no wise differing from that which Abraham experienced, must be attributed to an external and most formal casuistry. It is an old rule, that two persons may perform externally the same action, without that action having precisely the same moral import.¹ Can the critic prove that the moral value of the question of Zacharias cannot possibly be different from that of Abraham? Might not one and the same question be, in the mouth of Abraham, an expression of most profound submission; in that of Mary, of purest maidenly solicitude; and in that of Zacharias, a question not free from the reviving elements of unbelief? We cannot help it if the casuist is insensible to the importance of the actual state of the inner life in producing this variety, but we need not long occupy ourselves with his 'difficulty.'²

It can prove nothing against the historic reality of the late birth here announced, that similar late births were matters of promise in the Old Testament, as those of Isaac and Samuel.³ This circumstance, on the contrary, points to a peculiarity in the divine government, which is wont to call not merely the late-born, but frequently also the lost, the exposed, the greatly

¹ Duo cum faciunt idem, non est idem.

² It is moreover mere assumption, that Sarah's state of mind (Gen. xviii. 12) remained unpunished, when censure is elsewhere called punishment. The measure in which punishment was meted out to her, would perhaps have been more explicitly stated if she had been the principal character. It is only the caricature of an ultra-superfine mind to say that Abraham, according to Gen. xvii. 17, 'found the divine promise laughably incredible.' That, moreover, a distinction between the guilt of such sinful thoughts as die or are suppressed in the heart, and such as are expressed in words, is not blasphemy, as Bruno Bauer supposes (*Kritik*, vol. i. p. 33), need not be first explained. If any one represses a smile which may arise in his mind at the mysteries of revelation, and does not suffer it to appear, he has spared himself the greater offence. It is moreover false to say that Mary, according to Luke i. 34, asked exactly the same question as Zacharias. Mary inquired after the manner, Zacharias required a sign of the fact, a sign beyond the appearing of the angel.

³ See Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. 132.

endangered, or the overlooked among children, and to form them into the chosen vessels of His providence. These form an extensive category, in which may be reckoned, according to legendary history, Romulus and Remus; according to the Old Testament, Isaac, Joseph, and Moses; and according to the New, John the Baptist and Christ.

Dumb, and speaking by signs, solemnized, yet filled with sacred joy, Zacharias came forth from the temple to bless the waiting people; dumb, but happy in the certainty of the promised blessing, he returned, after having fulfilled his ministry, to his home. His wife Elisabeth conceived. She lived for five months in strict retirement, a hermitess, already entering into the destination of her son by her own conduct; her soul reposing in the joyful feeling that the Lord had looked upon her, and taken away her reproach among women. It was amidst the noblest of Israelite aspirations that John was conceived, and that the day of his birth approached.

SECTION IV.

THE VIRGIN MARY.

(Luke i. ; Matt. i.)

It was six months after Elisabeth, the mother of the promised forerunner of Messiah, had conceived, that the second and greater manifestation of the theocratic Spirit of God took place. Mary, the Israelite maiden of Nazareth, the betrothed of Joseph, received the heavenly message. The angel Gabriel appeared to her, and brought her the message that she was to be the mother of the Messiah.

This wonderful event is a rhythm of the mutual action which took place between the highest and most glorious influences of the theocratic Spirit of God, and the most elevated and holiest frame of that elect soul, who was to be the starting-point of a new and higher creation. The majesty of that power of God which was bringing grace, and founding the kingdom of salvation, suddenly appears before her mind in a holy hour of prayer

as a bright vision. She experiences the first effect of this manifestation; the word of God, from the mouth of the angel, that she is highly favoured of God, the elect among all women, resounds through her soul. Hence, the first word of the message is a greeting from God, in which her reconciliation, her peace with God, and her high vocation are assured to her. The blessed and glad surprise of the assurance of her eternal election penetrates her whole being.

But scarcely was this experience vouchsafed unto her, than her soul was troubled to its depths. In the surprise of humility, she was unable to understand the meaning of the salutation: she cast in her mind what manner of salutation this should be. She thus confirmed its effect, and made way for the second part of this message. Another and still brighter effulgence of the revealing power of God follows upon this humble fear. It is answered, and assured to her, that the highest blessing in Israel is destined to her, that she is to bring forth the Messiah. The angel already calls Him, and her rejoicing heart also calls Him, *Jesus, the help of God, the salvation of God*. He stands before her soul in His glory, the Son of the Most High. His form is justly Israelite: He appears as the royal son of David, who is to possess the throne of His father. But His nature is Christ-like: His kingdom is eternal; a kingdom which will develop itself in the infinity of the Divine Spirit is promised Him.¹ Lost in the heartfelt aspirations of pure love, she contemplates Him whom she is to bring forth. All the longings of Israel, nay of humanity, for the divine-human Lord and Saviour, for Him who was

¹ It is hardly necessary to enter into the general assumption of criticism, that a promise or description of Messiah is circumscribed by Jewish narrowness because it appears in the costume and colouring of Israelite Messianism. For this assumption everywhere proceeds from the view that these descriptions can be only understood in a carnal and pharisaically narrow sense, while in fact they were understood by all the genuine children of the Israelite spirit in their symbolical, or rather their ideal-real signification, in which also it was that they were uttered by the prophets. These critical notions presuppose that Christ could not be the Saviour of the world, in the conviction of the faithful Israelite. The measure in which the expressions of Old Testament Christology were understood and applied in a New Testament meaning, entirely depended on the individual degree of enlightenment of those who made use of these expressions. The Messianic idea of Mary must be regarded as essentially identical with the life of Christ Himself since it became in her bosom the birth of Christ.

to be the honour of the human race, kindle within her heart, and her whole soul is dissolved in desires after Him, under the influence of the divine announcement sent to her from heaven.

But she feels that this Being, as the highest thought of God, His express image, His most glorious communication and gift, soars high above her. How can she become the mother of the Messiah—she the virgin? Not desponding doubt, but the enlightened inquiry of a clear understanding, expresses its helplessness in presence of the Eternal by this: How? Mary inquires, with a greatness and purity in which all maidenly bashfulness is absorbed, in which true maidenliness expresses itself in perfect liberty of mind: ‘How shall this be, seeing I know not a man?’¹ Then follows the third and most exalted operation of the divine manifestation? The Holy Spirit bears her spirit beyond the limits of the old æon. She is baptized, in full inspiration, into the death of surrender to the dealings of God. Her development has now attained the climax of the earlier humanity. Painters rightly represent Gabriel as presenting to Mary the branch of lilies. The lily branch denotes her own life, in this perfect, inspired frame. ‘The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God!’ Thus that divine operation which she experiences, sounds like a saying which enlightens her whole being. The Holy Ghost perfects her frame of mind, and the power of God completes, while this frame continues, that creative work whose result was the germination and production of the flower of the human race from her life, the lily flower from the lily branch. The Word becomes flesh.

Mary abides in the glory of God’s wonder-working power. She feels certain that Omnipotence is at hand, when Divine Grace and Truth make a promise. Assurance enters her soul as a distinct word of God: with God nothing shall be impossible.

Thus her glance is enlightened to penetrate the sphere of God’s wonder-working power. In this clear vision of the realm of the new revelation, her soul perceives her friend Elisabeth;

¹ [Ellicott (*Hist. Lect.* p. 49) calls this the question ‘of a childlike innocence that sought to realize to itself, in the very face of seeming impossibilities, the full assurance of its own blessedness.’—ED.]

it is announced to her that the childless and barren one has conceived.

Thus had the operation of God appointed and depicted her lot. She must have felt what was before her, while treading this path of miracle: how she might become an enigma to her betrothed husband; lose her honour in the eyes of the world, and be led into the very darkest path—a path of death to a Jewish virgin. But it was the Lord who had called her, and He could testify for her. She said, ‘Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it unto me according to Thy word.’ In God’s strength she quickly decided, ready even to enter upon the darkness of shame, though more painful to a maiden heart than death itself. And thus was she truly the mother of Jesus, of the hero of God, who endured the cross, despising the shame, and saved the world by His death upon the cross. Henceforth God is to be her fame. But the abrupt manner in which her words break off, her deep silence, is very significant. She was absorbed in the contemplation not only of the glory, but of the deathlike sternness of her destiny.

Human nature had in its religious development, in its pressure towards the light, under the leading of the Spirit of God, now attained that wondrous height, which formed the centre of its historical, the end of its natural, the beginning of its spiritual course. As its first æon, the æon of natural life, had begun with a miracle, so its second or spiritual æon could not but proceed from a miracle. In other words, it must proceed from a truly new principle, a principle breaking through the old æon, with the superior force of a higher grade.

The Gospel announcement of the miraculous descent of Christ from the Virgin was opposed by all contemporaries whose theories of inspiration were infected by an Ebionite mutilation, and sometimes passed over, or but slightly touched upon, even by more orthodox theologians. There is, however, no reason for thus treating this doctrine, though fear of the profanation which this holy mystery so soon incurs from common minds might induce us rather to defend it than to bring it prominently forward. They who do not hold it in its connection with all the essential doctrines of Christianity, and a thoroughly christological view of life and of the world, and they who do not cherish it, in the simplicity of childlike faith, as the most glorious, the central

miracle of the world's history, cannot profit by it. But it is one thing not to bring this dogma prominently forward, and quite another to doubt or reject it. Its positive denial robs every other doctrine of Christianity of its full value. Neither the death of Christ nor His resurrection can be known in their whole significance, if His birth is positively misconceived. In this case, there is a crack in the bell, and its pure, full, penetrating sound is gone.

The discovery was thought to have been made, that this doctrine was non-essential, as being insufficient for its purpose. This arose, however, from the assumption, that it was set up by the Christian Church, for the purpose of representing the life of Christ as free from original sin, by reason of His miraculous birth. The sagacious remark was consequently made, that the removal of male instrumentality in the origin of a human being did not suffice to prevent his hereditary sinfulness, since there was still the instrumentality of the sinful mother, and the influence of her sinfulness upon the life of her child.¹ This line of

¹ See Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 183; Schleiermacher, *der christl. Glaube*, vol. ii. p. 67. Although Schleiermacher pronounces the view, that male instrumentality was set aside in the generation of the Redeemer, insufficient for its intended purpose, and therefore superfluous, yet he seeks to maintain a higher operation, 'which as a divine and creative agency was able, even if the generation were a perfectly natural one, so to change both the paternal and maternal influence that no sinfulness should be inherited.' [On the question whether nativity from a virgin does of itself secure freedom from sin, Witsius (*De Œcon. Fed.* II. iv. 11) contents himself with quoting two diverse opinions. Mästricht says, it behoved the second Adam to be in the first Adam *naturaliter sed non fœderaliter*, that is, to belong to our race, and yet to be free in His own person from the consequences of the fall; and this he thinks was accomplished by His birth from the Virgin. It seems obvious from Scripture that His extraordinary generation conferred on Him at once all that is conferred on others by regeneration. He was not born of the will of man, but of the will of God, and was therefore wholly pure from sin. It is difficult to see how this could otherwise have been effected. Young (*Christ of History* 264) says: 'It would have been incongruous, even offensive, had *He* not been thus physically separated from all of human kind.' An interesting chapter on this subject occurs in Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo* (ii. 8), in which he takes occasion to state that there are four modes in which God can make man,—'aut de viro et de femina, sicut assiduus usus monstrat; aut nec de viro nec de femina, sicut creavit Adam; aut de viro sine femina, sicut fecit Evam; aut de femina sine viro.'—ED.]

argument might indeed be of importance, if the assumption were a correct one. But the question is not, what is the result of a dogma? but, what are we taught concerning one of the great original facts of Christianity? and this sagacious argument looks by the side of this teaching, something like a child by the side of a man whose knee he barely reaches.

This doctrine has been attacked by the remark, that the earlier expressions of the Evangelists concerning it are not borne out by the Gospels, in which, on the contrary, Jesus is often designated the son of Joseph¹ (Luke ii. 41, 48, iv. 22; Matt. xiii. 55; John vi. 42). It seems, then, to be required that, in Christ's life, those duties which sons and stepsons owe to their parents, as such, should be omitted. It would certainly be acting in a strictly dogmatical manner, thus, in compliance with the requisition of critics, to sacrifice the due expression of filial respect to a doctrinal form.

Nay, it has been required that Jesus should have appealed to His miraculous origin, when the Jews spoke of His lowly condition. This requisition, however, need only be mentioned; its true value cannot be unappreciated by any candid mind.²

But when it is asserted that this doctrine is found in none of the writings of the apostles, except in the Gospel tradition of the childhood of Jesus, such an assertion can only be explained upon the supposition of a most imperfect acquaintance with the signification of those genuine christological definitions which so frequently recur in the New Testament.³ John clearly enough defines the miraculous origin of Christ, when he says, chap. i. 14: 'The Word was made flesh.' On the assumption of the natural descent of Jesus from Joseph and Mary, he could at most have said, The Word came in the flesh; but that the Word Himself should have become flesh, denotes a creative incident; the miraculous entrance of the all-embracing idea, in the concrete manifestation, the complete identity of the eternal Word and

¹ The assertion, found also in Schleiermacher, that even the genealogies oppose the earlier accounts of the Evangelists, 'by simply and inartificially referring to Joseph, without any respect to these statements,' must be designated a false one, with respect to Matt. i. 16 and Luke iii. 23. In the former, the ever-recurring 'begat' (ἐγέννησε) is not repeated in the case of Joseph; in the latter, 'being the son of Joseph' is qualified by the words, 'as was supposed' (ὡς ἐνομίζετο).

² Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. 185.

³ Schleiermacher, *Der christliche Glaube* ii. 25; Strauss, *Leben Jesu* i. 185.

human flesh, in the element of a new life. No doubt can exist of the import of this deeply significant saying, when we hear Jesus (chap. iii. 6) lay down the rule : That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit ; and make (ver. 3) the being born again of the Spirit the condition of entrance into the kingdom of heaven to all men who, as flesh, are born of the flesh.¹ The son of Joseph could only have become a prophet of God by being born again, and could not have been the Redeemer born in the flesh ; nor could it have been said of Him (ver. 30), He that cometh from above, is above all. The Apostle Paul, too, undoubtedly refers to the same fact, when he represents Christ (1 Cor. xv. 47) as the man from heaven.² He agrees with John in proclaiming the miraculous origin of Christ. The Christology of both is clear and decided, and raised, even in its first incident, above every Ebionite misconception. Paul represents this man, who is the Lord from heaven, as the second man, in decided contrast to the first man who is of the earth, earthy. He is the heavenly counterpart to the earthly man, the second Adam ; He was consequently made a quickening spirit, as Adam was a living soul (ver. 45). Thus even in His origin He was the second man, as Adam was the first. Had He become man in the usual course of the Adamic generations, He must have been attributed, collectively with the whole race, to the first man, to Adam. But it was that which was new, which was miraculous in His origin, it was His actual origination from the life of the Spirit, which made Him the second man. The statement of the apostle is, under this aspect, not merely an announcement, it is also a proof of the mystery in question. The review of Cerinthus, that it is an impossibility, has of late been repeated with approbation.³ It is said that such a generation would be the most striking departure from every law of nature,⁴ and again, that we must not indeed, even in a Christian point of view, confound the notion of a wonder with that of a miracle. A wonder is the effect of a new principle of life at its first ap-

¹ Compare Neander, *Life of Christ*, p. 17.

² Οὕτω καὶ γέγραπται, 'Εγένετο ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν' ὁ ἕσχατος Ἀδὰμ εἰς πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν. Ἀλλ' οὐ πρῶτον τὸ πνευματικόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ψυχικόν· ἔπειτα τὸ πνευματικόν. Ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς ὁϊκός· ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. Vers. 45-47.

Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. 182.

⁴ *Id.* p. 181.

pearance in a pre-existing and subordinate sphere of life, an effect produced by some sort of means. A miracle, on the contrary, is doubly contrary to nature, monstrous, and therefore only a fictitious wonder. On one side, it is deficient in means or historical proof; on the other, in dynamic foundation or ideal proof. It must, therefore, certainly be considered a miracle, that a human being should, in the midst of the Adamic generations, be born without paternal generation; and in opposition to such a fiction, it might always be remarked, that God never works superfluous wonders. It must, indeed, be granted that the first human beings originated without natural generation, but that, when once the way of generation had been ordained of God, the coming of a human being was not to be expected in any other manner. The plant, *e.g.*, begins, so to speak, with a wonder in its origin, in the seed, or in the root; but when its development has once begun, the stock continues advancing in regular progression according to law, till it reaches its destined height. Then, however, something new appears, viz., the blossom, the wonder of the summit, corresponding to the wonder in the ground. The blossom is not to be compared to a miracle, but to a wonder. There is an adequate cause for it, but, at the same time, plant-life appears therein as a new, and often an ennobled and elevated principle. It is not enough to say of this wonder, it *might* happen, for it is in the very nature of the plant that it *must* happen. It was thus also that the tree of human nature, according to the profound hint of the Apostle Paul, shot upwards from the dark earth toward heaven,—the wonder in the ground, the root of the race, Adam, corresponding to the wonder of the summit, of the development of the race, entering into a spiritual and heavenly life, the flower of the human race, even Christ.

When we consider that the second man appeared during the later stage of human life as the climax of the whole organism, as the counterpart to the first man who was its foundation, we obtain a harmonious and exclusive view, plainly bearing within itself a character of internal necessity. It may be indeed inconvenient to gaze upwards to this exalted height of humanity; uncomfortable to acknowledge that the second man, the principle of the world's end, has already appeared in our midst; difficult to suppose that humanity has already reached the highest point of its religious development, while its branches

still spread abroad in such rank luxuriance ; but it is really far more difficult to expose our view of the future lot of the human race to the supposition of an 'evil' endlessness, to ignore the unity of the race in its development, and to reject the announcement of the close of this development in its consummation, in the one individuality which presents the phenomenon of the divine life in the human. The flower of humanity has unfolded itself in the climate of God's presence ;¹ it has received the fulness of His life, and now pours forth the same for ever, in order to consecrate by its blessing the wild plant, and to ennoble it for life in heaven. As the first man originated, without father and without mother, from that creative agency of God which spiritualized the dust of the earth, so did the second man originate without father, by that effectual power of the Most High which spiritualized humanity.²

Generation is certainly an honourable and noble form of human origin ; nevertheless, being in itself only a function of natural life, its result can be only a natural one, *i.e.*, an unspiritualized, undeified human life.³ It is capable of sinking below the level of innocence, and in its rudeness and wildness might lay the foundation of a ruder and more savage form of

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 47 ; John i. 18, iii. 13.

² The passage, Gal. iv. 4, in which Christ is represented as made of a woman, is said to contribute nothing to the doctrine of His miraculous descent. Certainly the being 'made of a woman' may express merely the humanity, and even the weakness of man, as, *e.g.*, Job xiv. 1. But the definition here obtains a meaning of its own, from its connection with the words : when the fulness of the time was come (τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου), God sent forth His Son. For when the apostle further designates Him who was sent, as γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικός, this is certainly an expression for that culminating point, which was to appear in the fulness of the time, as the conclusion of the old æon. To say that the fulness of the time had arrived, was to say that a new vital principle had appeared. The actual instrument of its introduction into the world was the consecrated woman ; in His ideal descent, He is the Son of God. But this new man subjected Himself to the law of the old human nature, in order to elevate it to His own Sonship. So far does the expression γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον (made under the law) form a contrast to γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικός (made of a woman).

³ As then we have opposed that which seems to us the supernatural in the person of the Redeemer, so also natural generation, as being an act of the procreative power of human nature, through the joint instrumentality of the sexes, has been declared insufficient to account for His origin.' Schleiermacher, *der christl. Glaube*, vol. ii. p. 66.

human life. It does not, however, exclude the influences of the Spirit, and can even, under its consecrations, receive continually increasing light.¹ The Franciscans have represented the consecration of origin amidst which Mary entered the world, in the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin—a dogma which is the true type of a mediæval myth.

Mary issued from the theocratic race, which was consecrated by the Spirit, at the time when it had attained its highest development. In her person, the mutual penetration of flesh and spirit, the consecration of matter, had attained its highest power; and it was under such conditions that the birth of ‘that holy thing,’ in which the Word was to become flesh, took place. But the form of generation, even at the climax of its consecration, is not to be placed on a level with the formation of a human being taking place in the pure element of human inspiration, under the agency of the divine power. That inspiration of Mary, under which Christ was conceived and born, is represented as a permanent elevation of mind; hence her song of praise is not introduced, like that of Zacharias, with the words: She was filled with the Holy Ghost. She was continually

¹ The doctrine, that human nature is consecrated by the influence of the Spirit—that a still more mighty hereditary blessing was opposed to the hereditary curse, is evident even in the promise of the woman’s seed (Gen. iii. 15), and in the blessing of Noah (Gen. ix. 26, 27), but especially in the grant which Abraham received, that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed (Gen. xxii. 14). This frequently recurs both in the Old and New Testaments; e.g., Isa. lxx. 20, 23; 1 Cor. vii. 14. The most heterogeneous minds, Talmudists and modern poets, concur in the assertion of this truth. The Rabbis taught (comp. Zelpke, *die Jugendgeschichte des Herrn*, p. 47): ‘Omnes illi qui sciunt se sanctificare, ut par est (ubi generant) attrahunt super id spiritum sanctitatis et exeuntes ab eo illi vocantur filii Jehovæ. Ea hora, qua filius hominis se sanctificat ad copulandum se cum conjugē confilio sancto, datur super eum spiritus alius, plene sanctus.’ And Göthe uttered the significant lines:—

Man konnte erzogene kinder gebären
Wenn die Aeltern selber erzogen wären.

Had the modern Church as diligently cherished the doctrine of the inherited blessing, as it has that of the inherited curse, it might have far more successfully encountered many attacks, especially the dogma of Anabaptism. For the great prejudice of this sect consists in its denial of the Lord’s work in the very depths of human nature, His blessing in the line of Christian generation, by a rude and abstract application of the doctrine of hereditary sin.

filled with the Holy Ghost in these glorious days of her visitation. Our due estimation of the uniqueness of Christ's origin depends on our appreciation of the contrast which such a state of inspiration presents to what is obscure, enslaved, and often selfish in ordinary generation.¹ Natural generation not only always entails an incongruence between flesh and spirit, such as must be shown to be annulled in the Principle of Christianity, but must result in a particularity in the being begotten, such as must not appear in the new spiritual head of mankind. Not to mention the contamination of disease derived from their natural life, the curse of an evil disposition in their blood inherited in his blood, each descendant receives from his father and mother, through the reception into his own life of a proportion of the several partialnesses of theirs, a character which is both limited and infected with peculiarities; hence he can be but a single member in the organism of humanity, nay, he must be such; and it is with reference to this his destination that his peculiar gift, his province, his virtue exists. But for this very reason, no mere son of Joseph could, as the head of mankind, include the whole race. None but the Son of Mary, conceived by the divine operation, could, as the Son of man, become the spiritual head of humanity.²

With the birth of this second man, the first æon of the human race, that of natural human life, terminated, and its second æon, that of spiritual human life, began. The opponents of the doctrine of the miraculous birth of Christ cannot comprehend this idea, because they do not comprehend the general sublimity of reality, the ascending series of reality, the succession of æons which are ever exhibiting increasingly glorious spheres of life and manifestations of God's power. According to their view, we are now in the midst of that course of unalterable conformity to law, on the part of nature and of life, which is utterly unsusceptible of modification. The progress of natural

¹ Comp. Nitzsch, *System of Christian Doctrine*, p. 330 (Clark's Tr.).

² This truth flashed upon Bruno Bauer, in a passage of his early review of Strauss's *Leben Jesu*, in the *Berl. Jahrbuch*, cited by Krabbe in his lectures on the *Leben Jesu*, p. 71; and even though his announcement of it is defective in scholastic formulæ, yet this exposition cannot be called, as Krabbe insists, philosophical nonsense. Comp. Hanne, *Rationalismus und spek. Theol.* p. 96.

laws is like an immeasurable railroad, without beginning or end. We ourselves are in the train, without remembrance of the beginning or hope of the end, and they who should alight would be crushed by the inexorable wheels. Such monotony and necessity is, however, no faithful type of the world of the Christian, nay, not even of the world of the geologist, who has a faint glimmer of the æon, in the relation of the present world to that insular primitive world in which gigantic amphibii, perhaps the ancient dragons and griffins, grotesquely sported among the marshy primitive islands. A second and higher form of life then appeared in place of the first, and geologists allow us a better prospect of a third than many theologians. It is upon the massive and firm basis of a succession of æons that the New Testament develops its plan of the world. This is entirely æonic in its nature. It soars on eagles' wings towards heaven, and does not travel by the railroad of a mechanical philosophy along an interminable plain. The æon is a period of creation produced by and developing a new principle which forms its rhythm; it is the inner clock, the spring which is in all that is developed in vital progression. This period is at the same time an eternity, a special manifestation of the eternal. The æon begins with a principle which in a miraculous manner breaks through, seizes, and elevates into its own higher life, the former æonically developed sphere of life. Thus Adam was the principle of the first æon of mankind; thus Christ was that of the second. To him, therefore, who can rise to the æon doctrine of the New Testament, the reason of Christ's miraculous birth will be manifest.

Even the heathen had some notions of this miracle, because they had an obscure perception of hereditary curse and inherited blessing, of desecrating or consecrating generation. They dreamed in significant myths of the Son of the Virgin; Hercules and Romulus, Pythagoras and Plato, as well as many others, were esteemed sons of gods. These dreams were types of the Coming One.¹ When Isaiah spoke of the Virgin's Son,

¹ Compare Neander, *Life of Christ* 18. Remarks opposed to this view, as, e.g., those of Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 203, are noticed in the First Book of this work, under the title, Ideality of the Gospel History. [See also on the virgin-born Budh, and other virgin-births of the East, in Kitto's *Bible Illustr.*, *Life of our Lord*, pp. 80-94.—ED.]

whom he represented as a sign from God to his unbelieving sovereign (Isa. vii. 14), he expressed in his prophetic saying concerning the virginity of the mother and the consecration of her Son, who was to be called Immanuel, the mystery of that spiritual consecration of births, whose perfected fruit was to appear in the birth of Jesus. Many relatively virgin, that is, theocratically consecrated births, were to form the ascending series by which the miraculous birth of Christ was brought about. More and more virgin-like were the dispositions in which the noblest daughters of the theocracy became mothers; more and more divinely consecrated were the sons, who might be considered the produce of the most elevated theocratic dispositions; and ever more and more were these, the noblest children of Israel, conceived and born amidst the aspirations and hopes of their mothers to bring forth the Messiah, or at least a preliminary Messiah, a hero of God anointed with the Spirit. This was the consecration to whose working in Israel Isaiah referred, when he made the virgin-mother a sign of deliverance, and fore-appointed for her new-born son the name of Immanuel. At the termination of this continual consecration which took place along the line of Israel, the Virgin and her Son were to appear.

NOTES.

1. To avoid a partial view of the origin of spiritual, vital phenomena, it is needful always to distinguish between their historical and ideal origin. Every individual has his historic origin in his genealogy (Traducianism); his ideal origin in the direct realization of the divine idea of his life (Creatianism).¹ According to the former, an individual is a result of an infinite series of causes; according to the latter, a new and isolated being, a new divine thought, a singularity, destined, as an individual, to become, as a person, a celebrity. It is the historic origin of Christ with which we have hitherto been occupied. His antecedents begin in paradise. Christ is the seed of the woman, the express image of God, the development of that

¹ [Traducianism is the doctrine (maintained by Tertullian as being favourable to the doctrine of original sin) that the soul is propagated per traducem, just as the body is. Creatianism, on the contrary, maintains that every human soul is created as such, and united with the body in the womb.—ED.]

which had been defined as the image of God in the disposition of the first man. Religion is the first and most general form of the coming of Christ; God manifests Himself in man, man lays hold on God. But this piety on the part of man was at first uncaused, and consequently uncertain. Religion was shaken, obscured, and rendered for the most part passive, by the fall. It retained, however, a fundamental feature of activity. This became dead in Abraham. Man again laid hold on God in His word; God again called man by his faith. This was the second form of the coming of Christ, or the first stage of Christology in fallen humanity, the era of the promise. Then followed the era of the law. In the law, the mediator-prophet traced for the covenant people the first lineaments of Christ's life;—in the moral law, the lineaments of His deeds; in the ceremonial, the lineaments of His sufferings. The law pronounced a curse upon the transgressor, and thereby prophesied a blessing in the Coming One, who would perfectly conform to it. It was placed over the people, but its essence lay in the life of the people. Nor did this essence consist alone in the prophet who was the mediator of the covenant, but also in the covenant feeling of the people, and the covenant dealings of God with them. Thus was the era of the prophets introduced. This was the era of the commencement of the real incarnation of God in His people. The covenant people shone with the brightness of the increase (*Werden*) of Christ among them, that is, in the inspired frames and announcements of their prophets. The flower had fully expanded, but now the blossom vanished, and the silent period of the formation of fruit followed. The theocratic life began, as an inner life, to seize upon and penetrate the people to its very core, and the period of popular christological life, especially under the Maccabees, appeared. Finally, the last stage of historic instrumentality occurred, the stage of the concentration of the christological formation in the life of Mary.

Without an appreciation of this historic instrumentality, we cannot attain to a clear recognition of the conformity to law manifested in the miraculous element of the life of Christ. We should, however, be entangled in misunderstandings of equal importance, by losing sight of the ideal in the historic origin of Christ. According to His ideal origin, He is not the Son of David, but the Son of God. In Him, the express image of God,

the fulness of His being is manifested. The Son of God is, with reference to the Father, the expression, the character (Heb. i. 3) of His being; with reference to the world, the motive for which it was produced (Col. i. 15, 16), according to the ideal significance of its nature; with reference to the relation between God and the world, the Logos, the Word in which the revelation of God and the spiritual enlightenment of the world is clearly expressed. Christian dogmatism has sought clearly to express the ideality of Christ's origin, by decidedly holding that the divine Word did not take the person, but the nature of man. See Hase, *Lehrbuch der evang. Dogmatik*, p. 272. The decisions arrived at are in accordance with Scripture, in so far as they are calculated to exclude human limitation, speciality, and partialness from the individuality of Christ; but inasmuch as they trench too much upon His human individuality, they are akin to Monophysitism.

2. The Evangelist Matthew (chap. i. 22) refers the passage Isa. vii. 14, concerning the virgin and her Son Immanuel, to the birth of Christ, with the words: 'All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel; which, being interpreted, is God with us.' For discussions on this passage, see Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 174. For its right understanding, it is necessary first to obtain a due estimate of the historical import and occasion of these words. Isaiah is giving a sign that the Lord will deliver the land from the attacks of the kings of Israel and Syria. He gives the sign to the house of David, after it had been hypocritically deprecated by king Ahaz, that the 'virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name God with us;' and adds, that 'before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings.' It cannot be misunderstood that Isaiah is here speaking of a child who was to be born in the immediate future. The rejoicing of the land in this future is denoted by two incidents. First, the virgin, as soon as her child is born, shall express the disposition of the best in the land by the name she will give to her son: *God with us!* And then, when the child begins to awaken to moral consciousness, all danger will have disappeared. The rationalistic critic, however, insists upon making this immediate reference the ex-

clusive one; and he thus explains the sign: 'Prosaically expressed, before nine months have elapsed, the condition of the land shall be more hopeful, and within about three years the danger will have disappeared.' The reference to Jesus, it is subsequently said, is pressed upon the prophet by the Evangelist (Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 180). The 'prosaic' explainer should not have forgotten that history is quite peculiar in Israel. First, it is worthy of remark, that the prophet turns from the unbelieving individual, and speaks to the house of David. Then the sign is at all events strangely chosen. The young woman (עַלְמָה) in question is still a virgin, or at any rate has not yet conceived. Now it is fore-announced, (1) that she shall conceive, (2) that she shall bear a son, and (3) that she shall have the theocratic courage to call his name Immanuel. The choice of such a sign must certainly be regarded as Messianic, by those who clearly perceive the difference between Messianic types and prophecies. The theocrat, filled as his mind is with anticipations, unconsciously forms prophetic types; for it certainly accords with the progress of that life which was perfected in Christ, that the sprouting leaf should unconsciously prophesy of the coming flower. The highest kind of types are those typical frames of mind found in the Messianic psalms, and to this class the present passage undoubtedly belongs. Prophecies, strictly so called, are conscious predictions; the more general kind are unconscious, yet nevertheless prophecies in types. First of all, the Alma, the Israelite virgin, who by her theocratic consecration carries virginity into marriage, is significant. This incident is that which is properly typical, the very nerve of the passage; it is ethic virginity, which in its progress brings to maturity the salvation of Israel. The next is a *prediction*: she shall bear a son. The third belongs to prophecy strictly so called: she shall call him, God with us. The courage of that period shall be manifested by her disposition. Rightly did Matthew perceive the fulfilment of this prophetic and presentient expression, when the Virgin Mary brought forth the Son that had been promised her in a stable, amidst the machinations of Herod, and had the courage, in spite of the circumstances under which He was born, to call His name *Jesus: the help of God, the salvation of God*. (Comp. my work *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter der kanon. Evangelien*, p. 62.)

3. With respect to the psychology of the matter in question, theology is as little bound to explain the origin of Christ in the spiritualization of His mother, as the origin of Adam in the spiritualization of the earth. The striking natural analogies which occur in the usual course of nature are of a morbid kind. Physicians have spoken of a ‘fœtus formation, or growth of a human embryo, in a male or immature female body.’ See Ham-burger, *Entwurf eines natürl. Systems der Medizin*, p. 368. ‘The sufficiency of a single individual for procreation is a law with the lower animals, and cannot therefore be directly denied to the higher. Hence such sufficiency must certainly be an internal property with them :’ p. 369.

SECTION V.

MARY AND ELISABETH.

(Matt. i.; Luke i.)

Astrologers, in their superstitious enthusiasm for remote and subtle influences in nature, were wont to say much of the influence of the stars upon the births and fates of men. There are, however, stars which have the greatest influence upon the lives of those who are about to see the light of day, namely, the dispositions of their mothers. In this respect, we are justified in asserting that Jesus was born under the happiest star. Mary’s frame of mind seems to have been a wonderfully elevated one, a continuous inspiration. This inspiration, however, was, in conformity with its circumstances, of the profoundest kind. The saintly pallor of priestly melancholy, and the joyful glow of royal victory, successively lit up her sacred countenance. The experiences of the mother under whose heart the Lord lay were so peculiar, and called forth such states of mind, that the holy vibration of her soul between deepest sorrow and sublimest joy, could not but communicate to His temperament the purest seriousness and the profoundest happiness, blended in the wondrous harmony of a most sacred disposition.

Mary had surrendered and entrusted herself to the care of

God in the great hour of her visitation. She was afterwards assured in spirit that she was a mother. It was impossible, however, for her to conceal her experience from her betrothed, the carpenter Joseph. At all events, she could not leave Nazareth for months without discovering her condition to him. She might thereby have led him to misinterpret the reason of her journey, and have deceived him. In her peculiar situation, it seemed, moreover, a simple moral duty to initiate him into the mystery; nay, to give him up, in case he could not share her faith. The communication would naturally be a test at a critical moment, a test of his faith.

Joseph refused to believe her. He encountered the modest, but unshakeably firm virgin with decided doubt; the first Ebionite. He was, however, far more excusable than his successors, who reject all the testimony of God to the glory of Christ's origin. If he were to stand by Mary, he must be able to answer for her; for this, however, he needed direct testimony from God. At all events, he would not receive her without such authentication. The only thing he conceded, was an alleviation of the form of separation. According to Israelite law, a betrothed man was obliged to honour his betrothed as a wife, if he desired to separate from her. He might not put her away without giving her a writing of divorcement. In giving this writing of divorcement, he had, however, the choice between two forms. He might therein state the reasons for which he put away his wife, might state her guilt, and thereby expose her to public shame; or he might keep his reasons to himself, and thus put her away without reproach. Joseph was a just man, and decided upon the latter form of putting Mary away. The words, *he was a just man*, are usually taken to mean, *he was a kind one*. But this is unconsciously to assume that, in every case, extreme harshness is extreme justice; a false assumption. If Joseph would have put Mary away without reproach because he was just, we learn from this circumstance that he had a tender conscience, and could not dare publicly to accuse Mary as guilty. In the inmost depths of his heart her image found an advocate; it had acquired a veneration which now raised a doubt against his suspicions. Hence he could only say that he would have nothing to do with her; but his feeling of justice prevented him from accusing her. The gloss which would here

give to the word *just* the sense of *kind*, destroys the whole point of the narrative. The Virgin did not need to entreat from Joseph's compassion that he should put her away without reproach, she could expect it from his justice; and it was precisely his delicate perception of what was just in this case, which made his justice so honourable.¹

Mary then stood alone. Mistaken and rejected by her betrothed, she had the prospect of bringing up her child amidst the scorn of the Nazarenes, which would, in her position, be abundantly bestowed upon her, even if Joseph dismissed her without reproach. The most tender maidenly feeling that ever blushed upon a human countenance, was threatened with unlimited misconception and disgrace. But her heart was firm; she had offered up her life to God; she was sure of His guidance and assistance. Under her circumstances, however, she could not continue in Nazareth. It was the effect of the promise which was gladdening her soul, that turned her desires towards the hill country of Judah. Upon its heights a light was shining for her: her kinswoman Elisabeth, with whose wonderful condition she was acquainted. If there were yet *one* being on earth who would not misconceive and reject her, it must be Elisabeth, who had been called by the Lord as well as herself. Following, therefore, the impulse of her heart, Mary set out for the hills of Judah. They who have felt the rapid transition from unspeakable sorrow to peace, in a soul which must bring before God, and merge in God's appointment, its whole world, its very life;

¹ [It ought here to be observed, that the order of events here proposed by the author has been approved by few, if any, but Riegenbach (p. 169). It is scouted with his usual vehemence by Tischendorf, who says (*Syn. Evan.* præf. xxi.): 'Falsissimam esse Langii interpretationem verborum, Matt. i. 18, unde ipsam Mariam Josepho rem communicasse concludit, jam recte docuit Ebrardus.' But Ebrard himself seems to be as far wrong as Lange, for, founding on the traditional law that virgins were never allowed to travel, he supposes that her journey to the hill country did not take place till after her marriage. Lichtenstein (*Lebensgeschichte J. C.* p. 77) questions whether this law applied to virgins betrothed, and very justly appeals to Luke i. 56 in proof that on her return it was still her own and not Joseph's house she went to. Every unprejudiced reader would infer from Luke i. 39 that Mary's visit to Elisabeth *immediately* followed the annunciation, no event of importance intervening (certainly not such things as Ebrard supposes). She went 'in haste' to her natural adviser, her female relative. See the sensible and delicate remarks of Ellicott (*Hist. Lec.* 51).—Ed.]

they who have, in some decisive moment of their life, felt that nameless and blessed melancholy or godly sorrow, whose emblem is the white rose,—can form some idea of the disposition in which the lonely and rejected Mary, so poor, and yet so rich in the happy secret of her heart, took her journey of about four days towards her longed-for destination. This journey was not perhaps entirely in accordance with the forms of Old Testament decorum; but the reality of the cross she bore, bestowed upon her a New Testament liberty. Nothing can make a man bear more proudly and firmly the world's misjudgment, than the consciousness of that highest honour, the bearing of reproach for God's sake. It was under great and heavy anxiety of mind that Mary hastened towards her destination, like a ship, threatened with tempest, setting full sail for the harbour. Upon this journey she would pass the hill of Golgotha. The nearer she drew to the dwelling of the aged priest, the more must the question have arisen in her heart: Will thy innocence and thy faith here find an asylum; wilt thou here find a heart that understands thy vocation and thy way?

We are not surprised that her salutation should burst from her overburdened heart at her very entry, and seek out her friend in her house. It was the cry of need, or rather the painful exclamation of excited confidence yearning for love, with which the misunderstood Virgin sought for a welcome from her friend, the urgent demand of the highly exalted suppliant for the sympathy of a consecrated and initiated heart, a heart which could believe the miracle. Certainly a special electric force of sorrow and of faith lay in this exclamation. Elisabeth knew the voice before she saw Mary; she felt the shock of its tones, her child leaped beneath her leaping heart, she understood her friend's frame of mind, and felt what kind of welcome she stood in need of.

The outpouring of the Spirit, in which Mary was living, came upon her soul, and she exclaimed with a loud voice: 'Blessed art thou among women! and blessed is the fruit of thy womb! And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? For, lo, as soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in my ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy. And blessed is she that believed: for there shall be a performance of those things which were told her from the Lord.'

To every messenger of God, who has at any time some

great message, some instruction, or announcement from God to bring, the misconception which he has generally to endure at first, is a heavy trial. It is difficult to maintain the heart's assurance of a revelation, which has as yet obtained no citizenship in the world, against the antipathy of the world and the reproach of fanaticism. Hence the first echo of recognition, of acknowledgment, which the misunderstood prophet finds in the world, is to his heart like a greeting from heaven, a seal of his assurance, a sacrament. Thus was Mary now raised, as it were, by the greeting of her friend, from the depths of the grave to heaven. The joy of faith, so long repressed by sadness and sore anxiety, burst forth, and she rejoiced aloud in a glad song of praise.¹ 'My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. For He hath regarded the lowliness of His handmaiden.' Thus does she begin, and then her song of praise streams forth in announcements which may be regarded as expressive of the form which the Gospel had attained in her heart.

All men receive one and the same Gospel. And yet the Gospel is different to each, and takes a special form from the disposition and circumstances of each individual. When the atonement is viewed and represented only in its generality, without taking into account its reference to the actual state of the individual man, *i.e.*, to the manner in which it annuls the special curse of his life, the Gospel is made an abstraction, and is not viewed in the fulness of its results. It is highly instructive and elevating to see how the Gospel, at the very beginning of the New Testament, assumes in each redeemed soul the aspect of a special glory. To Simeon, the atonement becomes the assurance of a happy departure; while the aged Anna forsakes her solitude, and goes about as an evangelist among the pious in Jerusalem. It is with true womanly feeling that Mary says: 'All generations shall call me blessed.' But this is not because of what she is, but because of the great things the Lord, whose name is holy, has done for her. She next pro-

¹ If the Evangelist here makes no remark upon Mary's state of mind, as he did upon that of Elisabeth, this testifies to his sense for the delicate distinctions involved in the actual event. For Mary's state of mind, from the period of the conception, was a constant dwelling in the fulness of the Holy Spirit.

claims the great laws of His kingdom. He scatters the proud. He puts down the mighty from their seats, He exalts them of low degree. He fills the hungry with good things, He sends the rich empty away. He has now helped His servant Israel, remembering His everlasting covenant with Abraham and his seed.

As a lowly daughter of the house of David, Mary had often, and more than ever during her journey from Nazareth to the town of Zacharias, experienced the lot of the poor, the despised, the oppressed, and especially of those rejected ones who bear in their hearts the nobility of a higher vocation, of deeper reflection, and greater devotedness of life. She must, during this journey, have looked upon herself as a princess of such rejected ones. But now, through the greeting of her friend, she attained a higher assurance, that the grace of God had very highly exalted and would glorify her. She now saw the whole world glitter in the sunshine of that grace which raises the rejected; that realm of glory to which God elevates the humble and lowly was now displayed before her eyes. She had a presentiment of the Good Friday and Easter Day of her Son.

Some have insisted that Mary's song of praise is derived from that of Hannah (1 Sam. i.). But the two songs only need to be compared to arrive at the conviction that Mary's is thoroughly original; although it shows, by certain free reminiscences, that, as a pious Israelite woman, she was acquainted with the song of Hannah, who had been in a condition somewhat similar. It has, further, been asserted, that songs of praise, such as these, are not directly produced among the events of actual life, but are only the artistic reproduction of that life. But here it may be asked, how much poetic power may be attributed to human life? For Christologists who recognise the ideal height of humanity in the history of Jesus, it is certain that the poetry with which human life is everywhere else penetrated, as the ore is by the precious metal, could not but appear here in its purest state. There are countries where the vine grows wild, countries where roses are indigenous, countries where song is the natural expression of joyful emotion; and here we have found that elevated region, where the hymn comes forth in its perfect form, in the midst of actual life.¹

¹ They who have witnessed the exaltation of great characters in important circumstances, will comprehend this incident in its essential features.

Mary remained three months with her friend. That she should have stayed so long, and yet have left without waiting till Elisabeth's delivery, points to a change in her relations with Joseph. As the absent always become more dear, and the dead perfect, so did the image of Mary grow fairer in his mind after her departure. The impression which she had made upon him was one so pure and holy, that the Spirit of God would increasingly justify it to his mind. He must now have considered himself blameable, nay, harsh, and a conflict must have arisen within him. Such a state of mind was the immediate cause of the revelation now vouchsafed unto him.

Even a dream may become the instrument of a divine communication. In circumstances when the daily life of pious men is devoted more to the concerns of the world, the susceptibility of their minds for divine things would be more easily concentrated during the season of night, as the night violet emits its fragrance during the darkness. In this case, dreams become, in critical circumstances, a mirror for the reflection of divine visions. It was also natural that Joseph, the worthy artisan, should receive his revelations in dreams. The directions he received so agitated him, that he awoke, and communicated to him such assurance, such an impulse to set his misconceived bride at rest, that rising from sleep, he immediately sought her out. This seems clearly enough to point to a journey. He arose early in the morning, brought her home 'to her house' (Luke i. 56), and treated her till her delivery with reverential tenderness, as one dedicated to a more exalted destiny. Thus did the Lord, in due time, reward the confidence of Mary, and preserve her honour. This fact was, at the same time, a great victory won by the

In this passage Christianity and poetry change places before those critics who deny the historical reality of the poetry for the sake of opposing the historical reality of primitive Christianity. Even poetry must reject such critics and their dicta, as proceeding from a region where the beautiful is not true, and the true not beautiful. ['The critics seem to miscalculate, even on psychological principles, the effect on them of events like these, which assured them that the long-sought salvation of God was now about to appear, and that its pledges were already before their eyes.'—Mill, *Mythical Interp.* p. 116. All that this forcible and learned writer says upon the subject-matter of these hymns, as well as his whole refutation of the objections to these early chapters of the Gospels, will abundantly repay perusal. —ED.]

Gospel over ancient precept in the heart of the carpenter. The miracles of the New Testament times penetrated his lower life, and elevated him to true Israelite feeling. In intercourse with Mary, he also found his blessing, his gospel. The childhood of the great Prince of man and the Redeemer of the world was to be passed under the care and protection of an honest artisan. Thus was mere worth ennobled, and the dignity of handicraft honoured in its inner relation to the true purposes of the kingdom of God. The priest brought up the King's herald, but the artisan protected with his honest hand the great King Himself during the tender years of childhood.

It was at about this time that Elisabeth brought forth her promised son. The wonderful nature of this event, her happiness, which proclaimed the mercy of God, spread great joy among her kinsfolk and neighbours. When the child was eight days old, the festival of his circumcision was kept. The guests were anxious to give him the name of Zacharias; but his mother Elisabeth earnestly opposed it. Zacharias was appealed to for decision; by signs he asked for a writing-table, and then wrote the name of John! *the favour of God, the pledge of God's favour*. With this announcement his soul was freed from the reproach which had oppressed it, his tongue from the mysterious ethic tie or ban by which it had been enchained.

The song of praise which Zacharias now uttered had been so gradually and certainly matured in his soul, that, like Mary, he could not forget it again. His song pointed out the form of his faith; it was the expression of the Gospel as it resounded within his own heart. It was a truly priestly view that Zacharias took of the reconciliation and glorification of the world in the advent of Messiah. The coming Christ appeared to him as the true altar of safety, the refuge of His people. In future, the people of God, delivered from their enemies, would be ever at liberty to perform the true, real service of God, the worship which would glorify Him. This was the delight of his priestly heart. But it was the delight of his paternal heart that his child should be the herald of the Lord, in whom grace was to appear even to those who sat in darkness and the shadow of death. Such is the matter of his song of praise.

And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit. The youthful Nazarite grew up to his calling in the lonely hill coun-

try. The time was soon to come when he would be shown to and proclaim a vast effect upon the whole nation of Israel.

NOTES.

1. When critics insist (comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu* i. 165) that the angel must have brought to Joseph in a dream a revelation connected with that formerly communicated to Mary, must have reproached Joseph with his unbelief, and have thought it superfluous to tell him the name of the child, having already done so to Mary, they speak unintentionally for the reality of the said communications. For it is not in the nature of a dream to maintain a practical appearance. If, then, a revelation should take the form of a dream, it must renounce the condition of practicality. It must also renounce conformity to the law of economy, and to that prudence of critics which would rather blend several dream-visions in one (*id.* p. 261). Criticism would rather have depicted practical dreams. But in so doing it would have destroyed the nature of the dream. Macbeth 'slays holy sleep;' criticism, the holy dream.

2. Strauss makes an inaccurate quotation when he says, 'It is quite clear that *εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα* (Matt. i. 18) points to a discovery without Mary's acquiescence.' The passage runs, *εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου*,—she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Was this found without Mary's acquiescence? What justified the author in omitting the closer definition of the sentence?

3. Strauss and Bruno Bauer insist upon pressing upon Luke i. 14 the view, that the leaping of the babe in her womb first revealed to Elisabeth that Mary was selected to be the mother of the Messiah. On the other hand, they combat the notion that the emotion of the mother would, by the effect it produced upon her organism, occasion the leaping of the child. According to this assumption, the text would have run: As soon as the unborn child heard the salutation, it leaped. Elisabeth hears the salutation—Mary's salutation: can any one deny her emotion? The child leaps: can any one deny the connection of its leaping with its mother's emotion? Elisabeth views this leaping in the poetic element of her own frame of mind, and this sublime, transparent, healthy poetry is transformed into a supernaturalistic formula, according to which the movement of the

unborn child is said to reveal to its mother the dignity of Mary. This text is thus made to say, that the mother understood nothing of the spirit of the salutation; that the fruit of her body understood it immediately; and then that the leaping of this fruit of the same mother who found nothing in the salutation of her friend, was a plain revelation to her that this friend should bring forth the Messiah.

SECTION VI.

THE BIRTH OF JESUS AT BETHLEHEM.

(Luke ii.)

When Mary already saw the time of her approaching delivery at hand, she had occasion to travel to Bethlehem with her husband.

The occasion was a civil duty. According to the command of the government, which had ordained a taxation of the inhabitants of Palestine, Joseph was obliged to betake himself to Bethlehem, the town of his family, to be there registered according to his name and property. Mary was also subject to this registration.¹ According to the Gospel (vers. 1 and 2), this taxing was decreed by the Emperor Augustus; it was the first which had taken place in Judea, and happened when Cyrenius was governor in Syria.

We here encounter a great and much canvassed difficulty.² How, it is first asked, could Augustus decree this taxing in Palestine, when king Herod, though dependent upon Rome,

¹ That the words *with Mary*, etc., Luke ii. 5, relate much more naturally to the immediately preceding words, *to be taxed*, than to the preceding expression *he went up*, is evident even from the construction of the sentence. But when the parenthesis is made, and διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν referred to Joseph alone, this is easily explained. It needed not to be remarked of Mary that she was descended from David, this being patent to Christian consciousness; while it was necessary to notice the fact, that Joseph was so descended.

² On the whole question of the census, compare the excellent remarks of Ebrard, *Gospel History* 136. [Or the very useful work of Andrews, *Life of our Lord*, pp. 65-74 (Lond. 1863); or Fairbairn's *Hermeneutical Manual*, p. 461; or Davidson's *Introduction*, pp. 206-214.—Ed.]

still governed the country? And how comes Cyrenius to be mentioned, who, according to Josephus, did not come to Palestine till about ten years later, and that in order to complete the taxing? It is further asked, Why were Mary and Joseph obliged to travel to Bethlehem, when a Roman enrolment required no such change of locality? And finally, Why was Mary obliged to accompany her husband on this journey?

We must first repeat, that we consider Mary the authority for the history of Jesus' childhood. It is probable that Luke had a narrative by her of the journey to Bethlehem, which he introduced into his own work. In this narrative Mary would express herself according to the political views of an elevated female mind, overlooking the immediate authors of a public measure, and referring it to that supreme power which, though it kept in the background, was actually its author. Herod, the dependent prince, disappeared from the view of the narrator, who, from the point of view afforded by mental observation of the state of the world, was contemplating the source of the great political measures taking place in Palestine. Hence, in grand and womanly style, she named the Emperor Augustus as the originator of the decree of Herod, that a census should take place in Palestine.¹

Luke, the compiler of the narrative, would not, in his earnest truthfulness, alter this account. He knew, however, that this taxing formed part of a general undertaking, first completed by Cyrenius some years afterwards. He therefore inserts, by way of correction, the words: The taxing itself took place when Cyrenius was governor of Syria.² Subsequently the word *αὐτῇ*,

¹ If, for instance, a Westphalian woman were to speak of a levy of troops in her country in the year 1810, she would very probably say, The Emperor Napoleon commanded it, although, from politic views, it had issued immediately from the dependent king Jerome.—Mary likewise comprised the single taxing which Herod decreed with the general kind of taxing which proceeded from the government of Augustus. The expression, all the world, *πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη*, can never be limited to Palestine alone, not to mention the fact that a decree of the Emperor Augustus is here spoken of (comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, p. 228). Hebrew national feeling very clearly expresses the contrast between the Holy Land and the whole earth; an *οἰκουμένη* referring merely to Palestine, cannot then be imagined from this point of view.

² [Even though this explanation were necessary, the words of Luke do not admit of it; because he gives us to understand that whatever the *ἀπογραφὴ* was,—whether a taxation, or an enrolment preparatory to taxation,—

whose signification was no longer understood, was read *αὔτη*, i.e., instead of : the taxing itself—this taxing.¹ That king Herod could not but allow the organic movements which took place in the Romish state² to prevail in his realm, was but natural.³ It was quite in accordance with the character of the times that a

it was effected at the time of this journey of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem. They went up *ἀπογράφεσθαι* (ii. 3-6), not to accomplish something which might be separated ten years from the *ἀπογραφὴ*, but for itself ; and it was this, this *ἀπογραφὴ* accomplished by their visit to Bethlehem, which was at the same time accomplished under Cyrenius. So that whether we read *αὐτὴ* or *αὔτη*, we cannot interpose a number of years between ver. 3, when all went to be taxed, and ver. 2, when the taxing was made. But, as is now very well known, there is no necessity for interposing any interval between the decree and its fulfilment, between the birth of Jesus and the government of Cyrenius. The investigations of Zumpt have made it appear almost certain that Cyrenius was twice governor of Syria, viz., from 750-753, as well as from 760-765. This is exhibited in his Essay *De Syria Romanorum provincia*, in vol. ii. of his *Comment. Epigraph. ad Antiq. Rom. pertinent.*, Berlin 1854. A summary of his results may be seen in Alford, Lichtenstein, or Andrews.—ED.]

¹ We believe that the above statement corroborates the hypothesis of Paulus, which has hitherto merely stood upon its own merits, even without giving the origin of the change of *αὐτὴ* into *αὔτη*. The view that the second verse is a gloss, is a gratuitous assertion, and one which is so much the worse, as not answering its purpose, since the decree of Cæsar Augustus still remains in the first verse. This applies also to the assertion that *πρώτη* stands for *προτέρα* (see Tholuck, *Die Glaubwürdigkeit*, etc., p. 182). At all events, it does not explain the first verse at all, and the second only in a very forced manner. The hypothesis that Cyrenius came once into Palestine ten years before he was governor of Syria, endowed with extraordinary powers for the execution of this taxing, and that *ἡγεμονεύουτος* refers to these extraordinary powers, and not to his government of the province, is the most improbable of all. For the word must, at all events, relate to Syria, and may consequently designate only the *Præses Syriæ* (see Strauss, i. 233). In any case, an exegete should decide whether he will make decided use of any one expedient ; and to connect different expedients through an apologetic economy, is certainly not allowable.

² According to Suetonius and Dio Cass., Augustus carried on registration during his whole life (comp. Riegler, *das Leben Jesu* 313) ; and according to Tacitus (*Anal.* i. 11), left behind him the result of these labours in a state paper. Compare what Tholuck adduces in *Die Glaubwürdigkeit*, etc., from Savigny on the general census in the time of Augustus, and Neander's quotation from Cassiodorus, p. 22.

³ The taxing of Cyrenius (*ἀπογραφὴ*) of which Josephus speaks, *Antiq.* 18, 1, is more accurately defined as an *ἀποτίμησις*, and may consequently

registration should take place. But when a king instituted such a taxing, the Jewish national feeling would oblige him to carry it out according to Hebrew genealogical order.¹ Is it still asked, why Mary accompanied Joseph? We do not know for certain whether she was obliged to be personally present at the enrolment; it is probable that, as a virgin, she desired to represent the house of her father.² At all events, the expression of the Evangelist seems to point out, that she was subjected to the same ceremony as her husband. Thus much, however, is quite certain, that there was no law which obliged her to remain at home. She was now more than ever in need of the care of Joseph. But not this circumstance alone would impel her to decide on accompanying him. Her heart yearned towards Bethlehem. This town had of late become the object of her earthly desires. We cannot be surprised if the theocratic life in her bosom should have made the beloved city of her fathers, the object of sacred desire to her maternal feelings. A wish henceforth to dwell there might already have been matured in her mind, since after her return from Egypt she and Joseph were at first resolved upon so doing.

assume that foundation of every taxation, the registration of names. *Διτμή* also seems to point to this contrast. According to Tacitus, *Annal.* i. ii., Augustus had procured registers of the forces of kings in alliance with Rome. This is a striking proof that he was the originator of the registrations taken by the allied kings, and consequently by Herod, though they might not be carried on according to Roman forms. The census of Cyrenius does not accord with the description of such registrations. Hence the remark of Strauss (p. 230) against the signification of the passage adduced from Tacitus is of no force.

¹ Comp. Joseph. *Antiq.* 18, 1; Acts v. 37. On the Jewish form of enrolment, comp. Ebrard, p. 137, where he cursorily mentions the contradiction into which Strauss has here betrayed himself.

² It has been supposed (Olshausen, *Commentary* i. 119) that Mary, as an heiress of property in Bethlehem, was obliged to undertake this journey. If she were an heiress, she would have been obliged, according to Num. xxxvi., to marry into her own family. But it does not follow that her husband (comp. Nehem. vii. 63) must have been received into her family, and have taken her name, and still less that the wife must necessarily be enrolled. In the consideration of this passage, it has been overlooked that, as yet, Mary was only betrothed, and consequently personally represented her own line, perhaps that of Heli, especially if she were an orphan. Thus the daughters of Zelophehad had, undoubtedly, represented their father at a numbering of the people (Num. xxxvi. 2). In this case, Mary would certainly be entered as a virgin daughter of her house.

The poetic glory of the city of David could have beamed more brightly in no Jewish heart than in hers, especially at this time, when the hope of David's house was reflected in the happy anticipations and yearning of her mind. If the life of the child were reflected in the life of the mother, wondrous poetic, child-like, and elevated desires would arise within her. Bethlehem was Mary's desire.¹ The travellers had not been long in Bethlehem when the hour of Mary's delivery arrived, and she brought forth her *first-born son*.² According to an ancient tradition, reported by Justin Martyr, the place of the nativity was a cave, still shown in the neighbourhood of Bethlehem.³ It is very possible that this building leant against the side of a hill. Others suppose that it was in the manger of the caravanserai of Bethlehem that the child was born.⁴ A caravanserai, however, would be a place entirely inappropriate for such an event as a birth. The usual representations would have us seek the new-born Saviour in a stable. The Evangelist distinguishes the manger (or the stall, *φάτνη*) as a separate place from the inn (*κατάλυμα*). In Palestine, as in all patriarchal districts, there are huts in which the boundaries between the stable and the room, the dwelling of man and the dwelling of the cattle, are not very clearly defined. In such a hut this noble pair seem to have found a shelter.

The contrast between the eternal majesty and lowly appearance of Christ has ever struck mankind, edified Christendom,

¹ The assumption that a pregnant woman would not travel with her husband to a distant place, unless she also had been summoned, and that her journey is uncertain in the same degree as this summons is uncertain, is too naive to need discussion. If the critics who attack this text could by any means prove that a woman was forbidden to undertake such a journey, they might argue against the internal truth of the narrative with better success.

² Luke ii. 7.

³ [Justin's words are: 'Since Joseph had not where to lodge in that town, he rested in a certain cave (*σπηλαίῳ τινί*) close by it. And so it was,' etc. Maundrell complains (*Early Travels*, p. 478) that almost everything of interest is, in the Holy Land, represented as having been done in grottoes, even where the circumstances of the action require places of another nature. Matt. ii. 11 is not decisive on the point, because by that time room may have been found in the house, or because the house may have included a cavern behind, as described by Thomson (*Land and Book* 645).—ED.]

⁴ Comp. Ammon, *Leben Jesu*, p. 202, and others.

and exercised a sanctifying influence upon the world. The Prince of heaven, though rich, became poor, to make our poor world rich. That the Son of God should have appeared in such poverty, glorifies, on one hand, His divinity, on the other, human poverty. Divine love appears in its most surprising aspect in this submission to humanity. Humanity, even in a state of poverty, thus becomes sacred. The child in the manger is not exposed to poverty of mind because He is so poor in outward circumstances. His mother calls His name *Jesus, God's salvation for the world*. This glorification of poverty is at the same time a glorification of human nature itself. How far has the modern view of the world sunk in the tendency of many minds, below this Christian view of life! When poverty is cursed, the honour of free human personality is unconsciously cursed. Christ is the child of a poor traveller, born upon a journey, and, according to common ideas, in extreme want. He was first cradled in a manger. Yet Christ saved and infinitely enriched the world.

But it is not only the contrast of the ideal elevation of Christ with the lowliness of this scene of His birth which is thus striking, but also the relations in which the historical elevation of the holy family stands to its first entrance into the history of the world.

The carpenter Joseph, under whose care and civil fatherhood Jesus was placed, according to the counsel of God, was descended from the house of David. The Evangelist Matthew has given us his genealogy in a solemn and significant compilation, in a symmetrical arrangement of circumstances, significantly expressing the tragic course of David's line. After the first fourteen generations, the line attains to kingly dignity. In the next fourteen, it fills the high position of the royal house. In the last fourteen, we see its fall from secular royal dignity; and Mary's husband, the carpenter, as foster-father of the poor yet royal child, stands at the close of this series.¹

¹ The first series numbers fourteen members, including David; the second fourteen, including Jeconias; the third only thirteen, including Christ. It is impossible to suppose an error of computation in so definite a calculation. If, then, one is really found, it must be considered as intentional, and as pointing to some omitted member. Some have sought to render it complete by assuming that the Jeconias before the captivity was replaced by another Jeconias from among his brethren,—i.e., a relation who, according to the

Mary also was of the tribe of Judah. Many have indeed believed her to have been of the tribe of Levi, because she is described (Luke i. 36) as a relation of Elisabeth, who was of the race of Aaron. Israelites were, however, allowed to marry into other than their paternal tribes (Num. xxxvi. 2). The mother, therefore, of Elisabeth might have descended from the family of Mary,¹ or the relationship might have existed in some other manner. The Apostle Paul decidedly says of Christ, that He was of the house of David (Rom. i. 3). In the English version of the history of the annunciation, it is said of Christ, The Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of His father David (Luke i. 32)—a promise which, being addressed to Mary, by whom He was to be brought forth, must here be understood in a genealogical sense. And her union with Joseph is in accordance with this. Joseph was of the race of David; a circumstance leading to the conclusion that Mary was also descended from that king. For the marriage between Joseph and Mary exhibits very plainly the patriarchal characteristic of being caused by family relations. It would be far more difficult to comprehend, if regarded as a purely ideal and free one between children of different tribes. Hence it has from the very first been natural to regard the genealogy given by Luke as that of Mary.

The sole difficulty presented by this view, is the fact that Levirate law of marriage, raised up seed to his brother after the captivity. (Compare Riegler, *Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 444.) But it would be contrary to the law of Levirate in such cases to count the same name twice. Even Riegler does not resort to this expedient, but supposes the omission of one member. Since Mary is in this genealogy mentioned after Joseph as the mother of Jesus, it is probable that its compiler, by his evident omission of the fourteenth member, was desirous of leading to a view of the unique significance of Mary in this genealogy. Compare my essay *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter*, etc., p. 54; Ebrard, p. 151. Strauss's remark, that if Mary is counted, Thamar must be counted also, and Joseph left out, ignores the fact that Thamar's place is supplied by her husband, and that Joseph forming an independent member in his genealogy cannot be omitted. But neither can the calculation proceed immediately from him to Christ, unless an error is to be established. On the omission of single generations, comp. Ebrard, p. 152. It cannot be thought surprising if, in a genealogy founded on symmetrical principles, single generations are passed over.

¹ Neander thinks (*Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 20, note) that Elisabeth may well have sprung from the tribe of Judah. The passage Luke i. 5, however, speaks too decidedly to the contrary.

the names of Zerubbabel and Salathiel appear in both lines. This may, however, be explained by a temporary coincidence of the two genealogies, resulting from the ordinance of the Levirate law of marriage.¹ On the other hand, this view is peculiarly adapted to remove many more important difficulties. It offers the most simple explanation of the differences between the two genealogical tables, the turn of expression by which Luke designates Joseph as the merely ostensible father of Christ, and the carrying back of the line of Jesus to Adam. Luke, according to the character of his Gospel, was desirous of giving the genealogy of the Son of man. We cannot then but suppose that he obtained the genealogy of the mother of Jesus. He so far sacrifices to custom as to mention Joseph; but the very manner in which this is done, points out his true relation to Jesus and Heli, the living means of connection between these latter being Mary.

If Luke were, in his characteristic vein, announcing the nobility of mankind, when deriving the descent of Jesus from Adam, and the divinity of the origin of mankind, by referring the life of Adam to God, everything would, in such a genealogy, depend upon the reality of the natural succession. Only the historical descent of the mother of Jesus could be of any importance in such a view of the genealogy of Jesus. In accordance with this supposition, even Jewish tradition has designated Heli as the father of Mary.²

It was a sad and tragic circumstance, that the daughter of David, the mother of the King in whom that great promise concerning Bethlehem was to be fulfilled, 'Whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting,' should return in so poor and unknown a condition to the cradle of her race. The country was already dependent upon the world-wide power of Rome; the will of its emperor obliged this royal Jewish family to travel under the most trying circumstances, and brought them to the poor inn of Bethlehem, which suffered them to appear in a mendicant-like condition. The child whom Jewish anticipation had adorned with all the splendour of supreme worldly power was born in a stable-like hut, and cradled in a manger, while the despotic Edomite sat upon the throne of His fathers, and governed Israel.

¹ Comp. Riegler, i. 444; Ebrard, p. 159.

² Comp. W. Hoffmann, *das Leben Jesu*, etc., p. 165.

But the new-born babe was no pretender; the old world was not His inheritance, but a new and lovelier world, which He brought with Him, in His heart. The tragic shadows falling in a worldly point of view upon the holy family, do but give greater brilliancy to that divine relationship and spiritual glory in which it announced and brought in a new future raised above the curse. The beginnings of this new world play, like celestial lights, with marvellous splendour around the hard cradle of the Holy Child, and glorify His appearing.

NOTE.

As far as the relation of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke to the doctrine of Christ's descent from David is concerned, it must first be firmly laid down, that this doctrine is entirely independent of their construction. In a genuine and powerful family tradition, the tradition is not supported by the genealogy, but the genealogy by the tradition. Such genealogies may, under special juridical occurrences, become decisive documents, but the tradition satisfies the unprejudiced disposition of the world. If the family of Mary had made legitimist pretensions to the crumbling throne of Herod, our 'criticism' would perhaps be justified in taking upon itself the task of a herald's college and testing the genealogies, and on the discovery of traces of a suspicious kind, in pronouncing them invalid or doubtful. But it must then have a thorough knowledge of the science of heraldry, and a feeling for those embellishments and methods of treatment by which genealogical trees are often somewhat interrupted in their natural growth. Matthew seems to have been such a genealogist, in the highest historical style. The shadow of the curse and the light of the blessing play upon the whole of his genealogy. Luke, on the contrary, is a genealogist of the ideal style. With holy feeling does his genealogy trace the descent of Christ past David and Abraham to Adam. That Christ is the Son of man, the Son of God, and the Son of David, is the fundamental principle upon which both genealogies were written.

That it is absurd to admit the idea of mythic genealogies in a Jewish family, is evident from an estimation of the fundamental relations of Israel. The difference between the genealogies in question, has indeed been explained in another manner than by

the fact that Luke communicates Mary's, and Matthew, Joseph's descent. The hypothesis of Julius Africanus, according to which, both exhibit the descent of Joseph, which receives its twofold character through the parallel descent of two lines, in two Levirate marriages, has obtained much credit.¹ Apart, however, from the other difficulties which this view presents, it may be remarked, that it would militate against the great precision always observed by the Jews in their treatment of genealogical relations, to suffer an illegitimate descent to figure in the presence of the legitimate one.

On the composition and mutual relation of the genealogical tables, compare in W. Hoffmann's *das Leben Jesu*, etc., the instructive section, the Genealogy of Jesus, p. 148, which gives an ingenious explanation of the circumstance that duplicate names appear in Luke's genealogy, a phenomenon which Bruno Bauer has attempted to represent as bearing the impress of non-authenticity. The author ascribes Luke's genealogy to Mary. 'A genealogy of Joseph, adduced as a proof of the true human personality of Jesus, with the remark that he was not the true father of Jesus, and after the narrative of the supernatural conception, would have been utterly purposeless both to Jews and Gentiles; and either an extremely perplexing or an insincere act would be ascribed to the author by insisting that among the Jews it was only customary to give the genealogy of the husband. It was not that this was customary, but it was so, when giving that of the woman, to insert in her place in the table the name of her husband, whether he were the actual father of her son or not.'

¹ [Besides being adopted by Winer and Meyer, the view that both genealogies belong to Joseph is held by most English scholars; e.g., by Alford, Ellicott, Westcott, Fairbairn, and Mill. The ancient opinions are given by Fairbairn (*Herm. Man.* p. 181), and perhaps the ablest discussion of the whole matter is that of Mill (*Myth. Interp.* p. 147, etc.). Lord Arthur Hervey holds the same opinion, and has reproduced his work on the genealogies (Camb. 1853) in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*. The opposite opinion is, however, maintained not only by the author, but by Wieseler, Riggensbach, Greswell, Ebrard, and others.—ED.]

SECTION VII.

THE FIRST HOMAGE, OR THE SHEPHERDS AND THE WISE MEN.

When the first man entered the world, Nature surrounded his childhood in all the glory and bloom of her paradisaic constitution. The appearance of the natural man was solemnized in a natural paradise.¹ The spiritual man was also surrounded by a paradise when He entered the world—by a paradise homogeneous to His nature, a paradise of New Testament dispositions. Of these dispositions He was Himself the principle. As the flower must be surrounded by its garland of leaves, and Adam by his paradise, so was the birth of Christ, the bodily manifestation of the Gospel, surrounded by a circle of inspired dispositions and revelations, of reflexes of the Gospel. The centre in which the union of divinity with humanity took place, spread around it a great vibration throughout the mental world; the birth of the Messiah was that heavenly note which called forth wondrous responsive echoes from every messianically disposed heart. The Child in the manger was therefore glorified by a circle of Messianic revelations.²

Even on the holy night of Christ's birth, the shepherds of Bethlehem appeared in the abode of the holy family. They greeted the Holy Child, and then related the marvellous occurrence by which His importance had been made known to them. As they were keeping watch by night over their flocks in the fields, the angel of the Lord had appeared to them, and the glory of the Lord had shone round about them. The words point to a vision of the angel of the covenant; the incarnation of God had itself shed its light upon their souls. The Gospel which the angel of the Lord proclaimed to them, was just the Gospel for

¹ That we herewith deny the rude constructions of the origin of the first man which have arisen within the sphere of natural philosophy, and that, even in the philosophical interest of natural freedom, needs only a passing remark.

² It may here be, once for all, remarked that our view is, that in the realm of primitive Christianity there is for every christological human disposition a predisposing revelation, for every revelation a corresponding human disposition. The God-man could not but be surrounded by a periphery of the God-manlike.

these shepherds. He announced to them great joy to all nations: Christ born in Bethlehem; their shepherd-town honoured as the city of David; the Saviour in the manger. Thereupon they heard the praises of the heavenly host. Their hearts were so exalted, their state of mind so raised above the world, that they were capable of hearing the hymns of heaven at the birth of Christ. This one occurrence, however, involves a threefold effect: glory to God is manifested in the highest; earth obtains the peace of heaven; among men the good-will in which God receives and blesses mankind, has personally appeared.¹

It may be said that the ancient festal song of the Christian Church, *Allein Gott in der Höh sei Ehr*, was derived from this revelation from heaven. As truly, too, may it be affirmed that it originated in the night-watches of the poor shepherds; it is the shepherd-lay of the Christian world.

Mary kept all these things in her deep, faithful heart, and pondered on them in holy meditation.

After this strange homage, however, one still more striking was offered to the new-born child, by the appearance of the Magi from the East. They probably arrived shortly after Christ's birth, during one of the following nights. This may be inferred from the circumstance, that they entered, as the Evangelist at least seems to say, during the night-season, when the stars were visible in the heavens. Such an arrival at so unwonted an hour, points to a household whose usual domestic arrangements are still suspended by the novelty of a birth. The whole context, too, of the history leads to this conclusion. With their appearance is connected the flight of Mary and Joseph into Egypt. But this cannot well be misplaced after the presentation of Jesus in the temple, if we consider the remark of the Evangelist (Luke ii. 39), that the parents of Jesus returned to Nazareth after this presentation, as a genuine one.² They fell down before the Child, who was the object of their unexampled and peculiar veneration, and offered Him gifts emblematic of their homage, gold, frankincense, and myrrh.

The guidance which led the Magi to the birth-place of

¹ We leave to exegesis the discussion of the various views on this subject. Our interpretation is founded on Eph. i. 5, 6, and other passages.

² Even chronology leads to this view. Comp. Wieseler, *Chronol. Synopse*, p. 49 ff., especially p. 65.

Christ, was a miracle of divine providence. It shows how that love of truth by which noble and candid minds are impelled, contributes, under God's providence, to lead them with happy certainty to the true aim of their life, even if error should accidentally intermingle uncertain or even false assumptions; nay, how the preponderance of the spirit of truth converts even error into a means of promoting their progress towards the goal of knowledge.

The Magi, according to the original meaning of the word, were either Median, or especially Persian scholars. In those times, the Persian view of the world had spread abroad through Syria and Arabia, and 'Magi was the general name given to travelling astrologers, conjurers, and soothsayers.'¹ Wise men of those days were sometimes accustomed to make long journeys to seek the treasures of wisdom in distant lands. Hence it would not be surprising if these Magi came from the most remote parts. They may, however, probably have dwelt not very far from Palestine, especially if they came directly eastward from Arabia to Bethlehem.²

But how came these heathen philosophers to expect the Messiah? In answering this question, too much reliance has been placed upon an uncertain historical notice, while a great, certain, actual relation has been ignored. Suetonius, in his *Life of Vespasian* (c. iv.), relates that an ancient and definite expectation had spread throughout the East, that a ruler of the world would, at about that time, arise in Judea. Tacitus also similarly expresses himself (*Hist.* v. 13). It is, however, probable³ that both derived this notion from a passage in Josephus (*de bello Jud.* vi. 5, 4). Josephus relates of the Jews besieged in Jerusalem, that what most induced them to rebel, was an ambiguous oracle in their sacred writings, declaring that at that time one going forth from their country would govern the world. This, says Josephus, they referred to a native, though it mani-

¹ So Winer on this article in his *R. W. B.*

² [On the various traditions regarding the wise men of the East, see Kitto, *Life of our Lord*, p. 113, etc. On the astrology of the Magi, see Mill, *Myth. Interp.* p. 299, etc.—ED.]

³ Comp. Gieseler's *Kirchengesch.* vol. i. p. 47; [and Ellicott's note on this point (*Hist. Lect.* 44), who thinks the imitation is not clearly made out.—ED.]

festly points to Vespasian, who was summoned from Judea to become emperor. Thus Josephus had merely the Messianic hopes of the besieged Jews in view, though it was not without perfidy that he referred the Old Testament foundation of this hope to Vespasian.

It is, however, a world-wide fact, that the fame of the temple had spread through all the East;¹ that the Jews, at the time of Christ, had already spread throughout the world;² and that their religion had gained proselytes among the noblest and most susceptible spirits of the day. Nothing is more easy to account for, than that there should be noble-minded inquirers in Arabia, Syria, or Persia, in whom a receptive disposition had been kindled by the Messianic hopes of Israel, as by a spark from God, and had awakened great, though dim hopes and desires. To such a class of minds belonged also those Greeks who, according to John's Gospel (xii. 20), desired to become acquainted with the Messiah.

The Magi believed that they had received, in their native land, a sign that the King of the Jews, who had obtained in their view a religious significance, was born. They had seen His star. If we suppose that they looked upon a star as the sign of the Messiah in an astrological sense, we must think of a constellation as directing them. The astrologer, as such, deals with a constellation, while in a constellation the chief matter is the relation in which one star stands to the others.³ If this fundamental principle of astrology had not been lost sight of, such various notions would not have been entertained concerning the

¹ [Tacitus says, in describing Jerusalem (*Hist.* v. 8), 'Illic immensæ opulentiae templum,' etc.; also in c. 5 he endeavours to account for what he speaks of as a well-known fact—'auctæ Judæorum res.'—Ed.]

² [Schlegel mentions, in his *Philosophy of History*, that the Buddhist missionaries travelling to China, met Chinese sages going to seek the Messiah about the year 33 A.D.—Ed.]

³ Hence perhaps the expression, ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, Matt. ii. 2, is to be understood of the astrological definition of the star's rising. [Alford's reasons for rendering these words 'in the east,' are perhaps scarcely sufficient, though the reasons on the other side are possibly no more decisive. Neither do Lichtenstein's references (p. 91) to Rev. vii. 2, xvi. 12, disprove the author's rendering, for in both those passages the defining ἡλίου is added. The note of Alford may, however, here be referred to as an admirable summary of what is to be held regarding this star.—Ed.]

phenomenon of the Magi; nor could it have been considered at one time a meteor, at another a comet, at another the exclusive appearance of a new star.¹ Nor could it have been remarked that if a constellation of stars were here meant, *a* star could not have been spoken of. The astrologer has to do with *a* star which belongs to his hero; the meaning, however, of this star is made known to him by the position it occupies in the constellation.

The renowned astronomer Kepler has shown,² that in the year 747 after the building of Rome, a very remarkable triple conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn took place; that in the spring of the following year, the planet Mars also was added to them; and has declared it very probable, that an extraordinary star may have been added to these three superior planets, as happened in the year 1603. Kepler considers this remarkable conjunction to have been the star of the wise men. Ideler the chronologist further improved upon his view. Wieseler refers to it with the remark, that, according to a notice of Münter, it is reported in the Chinese astronomical tables, that a new star appeared at a time corresponding with the fourth year before the birth of Christ.

All chronological notices referring to the birth of Christ lead, according to Wieseler's calculations, to the conclusion that Jesus was born in the year 750 after the building of Rome (four years before the birth of Christ according to the ordinary computation), and most probably in the month of February. This conjunction, however, took place in the year 747 and 748, and therefore two years earlier.

Hence the Magi undoubtedly looked upon one star of this conjunction as the star of the Messiah. If they consequently judged as astrologers, it does not follow that the result could not have corresponded with their view. It would be a terrible tenet concerning divine providence, to assert that it could not suffer a sincere love of truth to gain its end, if it should accidentally proceed on false or uncertain premisses. Astronomy, *e.g.*, certainly arose from astrology, chemistry from alchemy; and the Son of man Himself came, after the flesh, of the race of Adam. This star then actually became, by God's appointment,

¹ As, *e.g.*, the author in his work, *Ueber die geschichtliche Charakter der canon. Evangelien*.

² Comp. Wieseler as above.

the star of the Messiah to the Magi, though the birth of the Messiah did not exactly coincide with this conjunction, and thus proved itself to be raised above this constellation. It was to the Magi a sign;¹ to the Church of Christ, however, it is a symbol that all true astronomy, all sincere inquiry, all the efforts of an earnest love of truth, conduce, under the guidance of God, to the highest knowledge, the knowledge of God in Christ.²

The Magi indeed, as pilgrims seeking the new-born Messiah, fell immediately into a false supposition. They sought Him in Jerusalem, probably at the court of Herod himself. Their inquiries electrified the Idumean, and his excitement soon spread through the veins of all the royal dependants in the capital.

The tyrant quickly recovered himself, and formed his diabolical plan. He first assembled an ecclesiastical council,³ and put to them the question where Christ should be born. They referred him to the prophecy of Micah (v. 2),⁴ and named Bethlehem. He then privately called for the Magi. He told them the birth-place of Christ, and requested them to inform him of the discovery of the Holy Child. With crafty prudence, however, he at the same time obtained accurate information concerning the time of the first appearance of the star.⁵ He

¹ [Augustin calls it the 'magnifica lingua coeli.'—Ed.]

² A modern astrologer would perhaps proceed on the assumption that Jupiter might be designated the star of the eternal God, Jehovah, inasmuch as Zeus might be regarded as the Grecian mutilation of the Jewish knowledge of Jehovah; a triple conjunction, therefore, of Jupiter, with the addition of Mars, would denote a threefold victory of the eternal God over the time or process God, and that in the sign of the fish, *i.e.*, of the Church.

³ Among the chief priests of this council were included those who presided over the several orders of priests.

⁴ The expression concerning the eternal 'goings forth' of the Bethlehemish ruler, is one of the most profound christological sayings of the Old Testament. The contrast lies in the facts, that the Ruler of Israel proceeds, on the one hand, from the extremely unimportant town of Bethlehem, on the other, from eternity. The Evangelist, in his vivid conception of the sense, has freely rendered the words, 'though thou be little,' by 'thou art not the least.'

⁵ The critic has no notion of this craftiness, when he supposes that this notice betrays the fact that the Evangelist invented this circumstance with reference to the subsequent slaughter of the children of Bethlehem. Still less does he perceive, that it would be a moral absurdity for so subtle a craftiness to make its next appearance in the aimless slaughter of the children.

perhaps anticipated that he could not make sure of these pious philosophers, who must have appeared to him either as rebuking spirits or as suspicious enthusiasts. The pilgrims went their way. But the circumstance that they suffered themselves to be sent forth from Jerusalem towards Bethlehem, testified to the supernatural assurance with which they had undertaken this journey. Their audience with the king seems to have deprived them of the greater part of the day. His manner and his directions very probably discouraged them. How should they find the King of the Jews in this small shepherd-town? Night closed in upon their wanderings in a strange land; but it brought them consolation, for the star was again seen in the heights of heaven.

If it seemed to them as though the star had travelled with them until it reached Christ's birth-place with them, and that it rested there, this enables us to understand the power and certainty of this conviction.

The critic, however, steps forward, and assures us that the stars pursue their own appointed courses. He gives us, by the way, a piece of astronomical information, which might make the high and mysterious understanding between the eyes of the stars and the stars of the eyes somewhat doubtful. But poets, and wise men of the East, and Christians often wander with the stars, and the stars with them. Must such happy beings be forbidden to speak in the language of the happy, that is, poetically? When they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy. But how did they so quickly find the abode of the child? asks the critic. Nay, but was not their condition peculiar? How does the magnetic needle find the pole? The magnetic needle is not made of wood.

Probably the repulsive impression which must have been made by the gloomy Herod upon chosen souls like these, still continued to affect them, and became the more vivid the more it was contrasted with the bright image produced in their minds by the mother of Jesus. The remembrance of Herod's expressions, his injunction that they should bring him word where the young child was, might awaken and increase within them a feeling of deep mistrust against him. Was it likely that they would conceal from Joseph the solicitude they felt?

Thus their own frame of mind predisposed them to receive a divine revelation in a dream. A vision of the night gave them

the direction they needed, and they returned to their homes by another route than Jerusalem.

Joseph saw the deep seriousness with which they departed in an opposite direction. The excitement of his mind became the element in which the spark of divine revelation was kindled. The command of God was announced to him, that he must save the life of the miraculous Child committed to his keeping, by a flight into Egypt.

NOTE.

It is only a proof of the extraordinary confusion with which the myth-hypothesis has snatched at similarities in the Old Testament to incidents in the New, that the star of the Magi has been connected with the star of Balaam (Num. xxiv. 17), and even derived therefrom. That star figuratively denotes the great King who should come forth from Israel, this is the heavenly sign of His birth. Critics are thus obliged to pass over the great difference between a metaphorical and a literal meaning, to catch at an appearance of the mythic. Comp. Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, Pt. 2, p. 57. Though later Jews cherished the expectation that the Messiah would be announced by a star, it does not follow that this was induced (as Strauss supposes, i. 272) by the prophecy of Balaam. The critic in question, however, makes this assumption, because he must otherwise have maintained that the supposed myth had been merely formed to favour rabbinical and popular Jewish expectations. These expectations must therefore be connected with the star of Balaam, *which however has, even with Rabbis, another meaning*, so that two appearances co-operating may form one greater appearance, from which the mythic appearance aimed at might be deduced. Instead of that constellation of stars which the Magi looked for, criticism is on the look-out for a constellation of appearances, for the purpose of gaining its end.¹

¹ [For an account of the use which has been made of this star as a datum for ascertaining the time of our Lord's birth, the reader must be referred to the very interesting discussions of the leading chronologists. Those who hold that it was merely a meteoric appearance, and subject to none of the ordinary laws of heavenly bodies ('not to astronomical but to special laws,' Ellicott), can of course make no use of it as a chronological datum. But very many of the ablest investigators (Ideler, Patritius, Ebrard, Alford)

SECTION VIII.

THE FLIGHT INTO EGYPT.

(Matt. ii.)

During those critical moments in which the life of the world's new-born Redeemer was endangered, the providence of God, in the centre of operations, co-operated by extraordinary dealings with the highly wrought emotions of the faithful human hearts who surrounded the Holy Child with their reverence and care.

The art of the calculating despot had been defeated by the subtlety of presentiment with which God had enlightened noble minds.¹ The mind of Joseph was meditating on the impressions of the day during the silence of the night. The angel of the Lord alarmed him by an anxious dream. He showed him the

consider the 'star' to have been the conjunction of planets (Saturn and Jupiter) which occurred, according to Kepler and Ideler, three times in the year 747; and they have on this account been induced to place the birth of our Lord in the same year. Others, of equal name, are inclined to give greater weight to the other data—the government of Cyrenius and the time of our Lord's baptism (which dates are independently ascertained), and to fix the year of the birth as 750 or 749. As Herod died about the 1st of April 750, the birth of Jesus cannot be placed later than this, or indeed later than February of the same year. This is the month chosen by Wieseler, and adopted by the author. Lichtenstein and others prefer the middle or end of 749.—ED.]

¹ 'That such an arrangement of matters (*i.e.*, as Matthew relates) would with difficulty be comprehended by the crafty Herod, has long ago been remarked, etc.'—Strauss, i. 254. It has also been long ago remarked, that the Gospel history cannot be held responsible for the folly with which craft is usually conquered in its antichristian attacks. Moreover, Herod would have been in the highest degree inconsistent with his known character, if he had detained the Magi at Jerusalem, and had meanwhile sought out and put the child to death, or had taken such other means of getting rid of Him as the critic considers advisable. He who had in every possible manner flattered the religious feelings of the nation, would thus have let his hatred to the Messiah be rumoured in Judea. The history knows his character better than such criticism does. His chief concern was to conceal his enmity against the realization of the Messianic hopes of the Jews, and it was this motive which guided his actions.

danger impending over the child, and commanded him to flee with Him and His mother to Egypt. At the birth of Jesus, the shepherds were already in the fields with their flocks. Hence spring must have begun. At all events, the rainy season of November and December, and the winterly January, must have been over.¹ Since, however, the death of Herod probably took place in the early part of April, in the year 750 A.U.C., and the slaughter of the innocents preceded his death, the presentation of Jesus in the temple could scarcely have happened before the flight into Egypt.² Unless we make the period of at least forty days, which must have intervened between the birth of Jesus and His presentation in the temple, extend so far over the March of that year as to reach April, and occupy a part of February, so that the shepherds were sent into the fields directly after the wintry season, we must suppose that the presentation took place after the return of the holy family from Egypt. We should, at all events, need a longer interval than forty days, if we transpose the presentation in the temple, the return to Bethlehem, the heavenly warning, which did not take place till then, and the subsequent slaughter of the children of Bethlehem, to a time prior to the beginning of April. All the statements of the Evangelists are most easily connected by the

¹ Compare Wieseler, p. 148. [This, however, seems to be considered by travellers in Palestine to be an uncertain ground for supposing that the birth of our Lord did not happen in December. They tell us that during December 'the earth is fully clothed with verdure.' And even though it be not customary for flocks to be in the fields at night during that month, the unusual concourse of strangers at this time in Bethlehem *might* induce the shepherds to betake themselves to the fields and make room in the town.—ED.]

² Wieseler, p. 155, supposes that the appointment, that a woman should remain at home forty days after her delivery, opposes the view that the ceremony of Mary's purification did not take place till the return from Egypt. This appointment, however, could scarcely forbid or hinder a flight from mortal peril. The same remark applies to the duty of a Jewish female, to make herself ceremonially clean by presenting a thank-offering in the appointed manner, after the accomplishment of her purification, or after forty days. This appointment could naturally only forbid the purification taking place *before* the forty days were accomplished, and it is in this sense that Luke ii. 21 is to be understood. In how many cases might a woman be prevented from observing the day when her purification was accomplished! Nor did the idea of the law of purification involve the necessity of considering a delay beyond the appointed time an illegality.

view, that the flight into Egypt took place soon, perhaps within a few weeks, after the birth of Jesus.¹

Herod had by this time become certain that the Magi would not return to him. This must have much exasperated a man of his disposition, and have driven him to extremities in his fear of the Messianic Child. He probably, however, formed his designs in secret, as it was in secret also that he had dealt with the Magi. He was too politic a man openly to express his criminal hatred of the promised Son of David.

Terrible things then took place in Bethlehem and its neighbourhood. Our notions of the occurrence take the following form. It was spring, and the parents were, for the most part, occupied in the fields. Soon, however, first one, then another, missed one of their children. One disappeared; another was found suffocated, poisoned, or stabbed, and bathed in its blood. In these mysterious and dreadful events, however, one strange feature of resemblance uniformly prevailed; viz., that only boys were slain; and, moreover, only boys of the tenderest age, none over two years old. The number of these unfortunates could not be great; but the suffering and fear were terribly increased by the mystery and inevitable nature of the danger.

Whence these terrible assassinations arose, no political writer, and no Jew except the hired murderers, could know. But Chris-

Wieseler himself remarks of the flight into Egypt (p. 157): 'From Bethlehem, which was situate in the south of Palestine, the Egyptian border at Rhinokolura might easily be reached in three or four days, and the parents of Jesus would, in their flight, have travelled as speedily as possible.' Since then, Joseph, in returning from Egypt, must have made a very long circuit if he had not travelled through Judea, the realm of Archelaus, we cannot but suppose that he was already in this region when he heard of Archelaus, and feared to go thither. I cannot, however, understand, as Hug does, the striking words, *ἐφοβήθη ἐκεῖ ἀπελθεῖν*, to mean, *he went thither with a fearful heart*, but, he feared to betake himself thither, or to settle there. The expression *ἀνεχώρησεν*, etc., also accords with this, after the analogy of Matt. iv. 12, xii. 15, xiv. 13. It denotes a fugitive, timid, or hasty departure of the subject from the place in which he then finds himself. The Evangelist could not have used the word in this sense however, unless he were impressed with the notion that Joseph was already in Judea.

¹ [The order of events followed by the best recent authorities is, that the presentation took place on the fortieth day; that a very few days after this, the visit of the Magi occurred; and immediately succeeding that, the flight into Egypt.—ED.]

tian feeling, which had been warned against the attempts of the tyrant, and knew the meaning of the circumstance, that the slain children were two years old and under, could say with certainty: Herod is the originator of this deed. As Peter by the spirit of prophecy announced the secret of Ananias, so probably did Mary that of Herod, from which this slaughter proceeded.¹ Then arose a bitter lamentation upon the heights of Bethlehem. It was as though Rachel, the ancestress of Israel, who was buried at Rama, not far from Bethlehem, had risen from her grave to bewail the woes of her children.

As soon as Herod was dead, and therefore not long after the flight into Egypt, Joseph was warned in a dream to return home again. The mental life of this remarkable man had been progressively perfecting in a peculiar manner, since he had come into the singular relation in which he stood to the most import-

¹ Our view fully explains why Josephus could not know that this event was a measure of Herod's. He must have been a Christian, and initiated into the mysteries of the history of Christ's childhood, for the slaughter of the children of Bethlehem to have any political or historical significance in his eyes. It needs no explanation, that Herod, the murderer of his wife Mariamne, and of several of his sons (Alexander, Aristobulus, and Antipater), a despot, who, when his death drew near, caused the chief men of his kingdom to be imprisoned in the circus at Jericho, with the purpose of killing them at his death, that there might be a great mourning throughout the land, and concerning whom Augustus declared, that he would rather be the swine of Herod than his son—that so cruel a man should have been capable of the deed mentioned by the Evangelist. The passage in the heathen author Macrobius, confusing the history of the slaughter of the children of Bethlehem—which this author, who wrote at the end of the fourth century, might well have derived from Christian tradition—with the well-known political occurrence of the execution of Antipater, Herod's son, is, partly on account of this confusion, partly on account of the late date of the narrative, not calculated to be regarded as a testimony to this event. [On the silence of Josephus regarding the events of the Gospel narratives, see the judicious remarks of Ewald (*Christus* 119, etc.), and the entirely satisfactory account of Mill (*Myth. Interp.* 289, etc.). The same author's criticism of the passage of Macrobius must be regarded as establishing, that the *bon mot* of Augustus is genuine, was uttered on the occasion of the massacre at Bethlehem, did not confound that massacre with the death of Antipater, which was ratified by the Emperor himself, and thus attests by *independent heathen tradition* the truth of the Gospel history. And even though Macrobius obtained his idea of the occasion and purport of the Emperor's jest from Christian tradition (which is most improbable), yet even thus it would be manifest that the massacre was accepted as historic fact.—ED.]

ant facts and most glorious persons of the world's history. The noblest reverence for Mary, that ministering to her to which the providence of God had called him, anxious solicitude for the Holy Child entrusted to his protection, filled his heart with a tender awe when he was resting from the toils of the day during the hours of darkness, and made the night-side of his mental life a camera obscura for those divine directions which protected the life of the Holy Child. Through his fidelity to his trust, his character rose to the height of true Christian geniality, he became the night-watcher before the tent of the new-born Prince of mankind. That the angel of the Lord spoke to him only in dreams, is characteristic. But that these dreams were multiplied, makes his character not improbable, but remarkable. And why should not even Joseph appear as a remarkable man in such a circle, under the impulse of such events? Even if not naturally such, he could not but become one. And when once he had entered upon such a course, how likely it was that many of the turning points of his life should be reflected on and decided during the night-season! The Holy Child was the light of his midnights. But why, asks criticism, did not the angel of the Lord, at least, blend the two last prophetic dreams into one?

Psychologists, however, assert that prophetic dreams are never dialectic, but often rhythmical.

Scarcely, then, had the fugitives arrived in Egypt, than the danger was over, and the call to them to return went forth. They accordingly came again into the land of Israel.

NOTES.

1. The passages, Matt. i. 22, ii. 5, 16, 18, 23, in which Matthew speaks of strange fulfilments of Old Testament sayings, will be spoken of in their proper connection. But the remark already made by others, that the facts of the Gospel history are entirely independent of the exegesis of the Evangelist, must be made here. Or does criticism really assume that the Evangelist could not but be an infallible exegete? It is only when criticism makes such an assumption sincerely, and at the same time considers her own exegesis infallible in the points in which it differs from that of the Evangelist, that she can find that exegetical difficulties in such passages can cast a doubt upon

historical facts. [The exegesis of Matthew is very thoroughly justified by Mill, p. 317, etc.—ED.]

2. Tradition has fixed the sojourn of the parents of Jesus in Egypt as near to Israel as possible. The Israelite temple of Onias was at Leontopolis, and the fugitives are said to have dwelt at Matara in its neighbourhood. The statement of the actual history is not affected by this tradition; it is rather the political extent of Egypt towards Palestine at the time of Christ, which should be considered in reviewing this event.

SECTION IX.

THE PRESENTATION OF JESUS IN THE TEMPLE.

(Luke ii.)

In His relation to the essential appointments of the Old Testament law, Jesus was an Israelite who exhibited a life passed in conformity to the law, under the impulses of liberty. It was not till death that He was released from Israelite responsibilities. Through the law, He died to the law, as Paul and His people generally did, in fellowship with Him. Till His death upon the cross, however, by which His nation thrust Him out into the world, He exhibited His divine liberty under the condition of Israelite religious national duty.

Thus also did Mary act with the Holy Child. It never struck her to claim exemption for her child from Jewish duties. She understood too well the signification of the manifestation of the Son of God in the flesh. From her stand-point, however, she could not take a part in the typical customs which the birth of the child required, with slavish devotion and admiration.

The circumcision of the child was simply performed eight days after His birth, the time appointed by the law. The sign of theocratic civilisation¹ had no other import for the sacred body, without spot or blemish, than that it thus became free from blame in the eyes of the Jewish Church.² There was nothing

¹ Comp. Winer's *R. W. B.*, Art. Beschneidung.

² [The imputation of our sin to Christ began at the moment He took our nature upon Him; and being, as Mediator, subject to the law both in its

to ennoble in Him ; the angel had named Him Jesus before He was conceived in the womb. Thus He brought the nobility of the true circumcision or civilisation of nature into the world with Him. Hence it was the most essential part of the ceremony that this name, *Jesus*, should now be given to Him. As the ceremony could only bear testimony to His native nobility, His name bore testimony to His true destiny.

It has been justly remarked, that the simple celebration of the circumcision of Jesus stands in remarkable contrast to the great festivities with which the circumcision of John was solemnized. John concluded the Old Covenant. In him the rite of circumcision solemnized its last glory. Jesus commenced the New Covenant. In His life the rite was only the performance of a national duty.

During the flight into Egypt, the time which must intervene between a birth and the rite of purification had elapsed. Hence, when the holy family returned home, their first business was to present the child in the temple.

There were in this case two religious duties to fulfil. The greater of these was, that the child, as a first-born son, must be offered to the Lord (Exod. xiii. 2 ; Num. xviii. 15, 16). As a first-born, He was regarded as a sacrifice, whose life belonged to the Lord, and must therefore be redeemed by a sacrifice. God had once inflicted death upon the first-born of Egypt and spared the first-born of Israel ; hence they were, in a special sense, dedicated to Him (Exod. xiii. 2). Therewith also was connected the notion, that the priesthood of the family was the duty of the first-born. Since, however, according to the theocratic appointment, the tribe of Levi represented the first-born of the nation in this duty, the redemption took place with reference to this obligation also (Num. xviii.). In the latter respect, the sacrifice seems to have been appointed to be rendered in money, viz., five shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary. It was thus that Jesus was now redeemed from the service of the temple, while His mother at the same time celebrated the rite of her purification. If the woman had borne a son, she was to offer a lamb forty days after, or, if she were poor, a pair of turtle-doves or requirements and penalty, His circumcision had a meaning in the eye of God as well as in the eye of the Church. It was the sign of subjection to the whole law in all its aspects.—ED.]

young pigeons (Lev. xii. 8). According to the statement of the Evangelist, Mary brought the offering of the poor.

While the parents were offering their sacrifice in the temple, the aged Simeon¹ accosted and greeted them as though he had long known and waited for them. He took the child in his arms and praised God.

His prayer was indeed a swan's song: 'Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word; for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation.' He rejoiced that he could now die happily. He is the noblest type of the Jewish, and especially of the prophetic mind. With deep sorrow does he seem to have lamented the fall of his nation; a sorrow so deep, so tragically painful, that he could not die till his eyes had beheld the Messiah. God had, by the Spirit, given him a pledge that he should not die till he had seen the Christ. It was his joy, but also his sorrow. Hence is he, in the noblest sense, the wandering Jew of the Old Covenant, or rather its wandering Christologist. Now he is released from this fate. He has seen the Messiah; he can now die. His song of praise in the temple has not a Jewish sound. He praises the Saviour, first, as the salvation prepared before the face of all nations, as a light to lighten the Gentiles; he then calls Him the glory of His people Israel. Such words, especially in the mouth of an aged Jew, and spoken in the temple, testify to the most glorious presentiment of Gospel liberty. This is the form the Gospel takes with him. It is great, free, and world-embracing. But it is also very sad. Simeon blesses the parents of Jesus, and announces to Mary the sore conflict of the future. 'This child is set for the fall and rising again of many in Israel, and for a sign that shall be spoken against.' 'A sword shall pierce thine own soul also,' said he to Mary; adding, with deep sorrow, the words, 'The thoughts of many hearts shall be revealed,' as though his eye penetrated the deep corruption of the Jewish hierarchy.

It was his gospel that he could fall asleep in the peace of his Lord before Good Friday came. What a character!

But how did he find the holy family? A mysterious but powerful impulse of the Spirit had led him to the temple. And

¹ He has been supposed, though without foundation, to have been Rabbi Simeon, the son of Hillel, and father of Gamaliel, who filled the office of president of the Sanhedrim after Hillel.

how could he distinguish the Holy Child from an ordinary child? asks the critic. But who would judge of the prophetic glance of an aged man such as he was by his own feeble powers of discrimination? Besides, Simeon saw the child with His mother. And thousands in the middle ages learned to know the glory of the child, through the noble form of the mother.¹

But why were the parents astonished at the words of Simeon concerning the child? asks the critic again. Truly they already knew all; they knew that the child was the Son of God. If nevertheless they were astonished, it was not because they heard perhaps an orthodox formula, but in free and heartfelt delight especially that God should have revealed this holy secret to Simeon. How often is it considered perfectly becoming to be astonished at the higher mysteries of this world? The prophetess Anna now joins the group. She was an aged widow, the daughter of one Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser. She forms a striking contrast to the aged Simeon. He was led by the Spirit to the temple. With her it was an old custom to continue in the temple, with prayer and fasting. He solemnly chanted forth his dying lay at the sight of Christ; she gained fresh life and courage from the same sight, and began to publish the glad tidings to them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem. So different were these characters, and their believing reception of the Gospel, and yet they exhibited a unity, in which the true Messianic life of Israel greeted the Redeemer in the temple.

They who make teleology a reproach to us, and insist that when a butterfly, a hurricane, or even an historical event is in question, we must not inquire concerning its purpose, meet us here with the inquiry, what purpose could there be in bestowing so great a revelation upon these aged people?² They ask us, for what purpose does this old man, in his second childhood, thus dress himself in festal grave-clothes to chant his swan-like lay, and the aged Anna hasten again, like a bride, through the streets of Jerusalem?

¹ [This explanation rather mars than assists that just given. The statement of Luke (ii. 27), that Simeon came 'by the Spirit' into the temple, is of itself sufficient explanation of his recognition of the Messiah. Comp. the apocryphal account quoted by Ellicott, p. 67.—ED.]

² Strauss, i. 290. Comp. Ebrard, 175.

NOTE.

It is worthy of note, that even Neander (*Life of Christ*, p. 25) feels bound to defend the presentation in the temple. ‘Both (namely, the offering of the redemption-money for Jesus, and the sacrifice of purification for Mary) are striking when compared with the circumstances which preceded the birth of this child,’ etc. The Apostle Paul has entirely done away with anything that might be striking by that beautiful saying, ‘He thought it not robbery to be equal with God.’ If it should be felt a difficulty, that Christ displayed His divine life amidst the restrictions of Judaism, it must seem quite as striking that He should display it amidst the restrictions of humanity. The glorification, however, of limitation was part of the purpose of His mission. While supranaturalistic prejudice is ever involuntarily criticising the full and sufficient form of Christ’s incarnation, and hence finding in such features of conformity to the law as occur in His life a kind of voluntary complaisance; rationalistic critics would, on the contrary, often make Him display an antinomian spirit, nay, a spirit of opposition to Jewish ecclesiasticism. This arises from a want of appreciation for the distinction between the essential law and the scrupulous observance in Israel. Upon this distinction depends that glorious alternation between conformity to law, and liberty displayed in the life of Jesus, that infinite dexterity with which His pure walk was ever able to steer between the observance of law and the non-observance of scrupulous additions;—to dance among eggs without breaking them, would but poorly express the difficulty of such a course.

 SECTION X.

THE SETTLEMENT IN NAZARETH.

(Luke ii. Matt. ii.)

The pious evangelist, Anna, may perhaps have spoken almost too much of the wondrous Child in Jerusalem. Archelaus was

just the man to renew the attacks of his father upon the life of the Messiah. Augustus had not made him king, but only ethnarch of Judea. Though already warned, however, by an appeal of the people against his succession, he treated both Jews and Samaritans with cruel harshness. The danger to the holy family could not have been so great as to make it unsafe for them to enter Jerusalem; for Herod had not publicly persecuted the Messiah, and still less was this child of a poor mother publicly known as the Messiah. Nevertheless the holy family might have incurred danger by a continued sojourn under the sceptre of this despot. The grave expressions of Simeon concerning the sorrows in store for Mary, might have contributed to the anxieties of the parents of Jesus. Finally, a divine warning again vouchsafed to Joseph in a dream, decided them on not remaining in Judea, and Mary was obliged to sacrifice her day-dream of bringing up her child for His high vocation in the city of David, to the divine guidance.

Joseph arose and turned aside into the parts of Galilee (ii. 22).

They returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth (Luke ii. 39).

Matthew found it difficult for his Jewish heart to reconcile itself to the fact that Jesus grew up in Nazareth. Hence he sought, above all things, to point out the harmony of this strange phenomenon with the Old Testament. It was with this motive that he wrote the significant sentence: He came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene. Matthew speaks, as it seems, from the point of view of a Galilean, who was abiding on the shores of the lake of Gennesareth, when the parents of Jesus again settled in Nazareth. It was then that the Messiah came into his neighbourhood, then first that He became a dweller in Nazareth. It is the main point with him, that the Messiah, who had not yet dwelt in Nazareth, became by this settlement a Nazarene. In his purpose of bringing forth this fact, it is a matter of indifference to him that the parents of Jesus had also formerly dwelt there. But that Jesus should become a Nazarene, seems to him such a difficulty, that he cites the prophets collectively as witnesses to the fact that this was involved in the destiny of the Messiah.

They said, He shall be called a Nazarene. Neither an extinct saying of some prophet, nor any single prophetic utterance in general, can be here alluded to, and still less the similarity in sound of the word Nezer (נֶזֶר Isa. xi. 1), the branch.¹ Nothing but a desperate desire to find an explanation at any cost could lay hold on the word Nazarite. It was only at a period when the word Nazarene was applied as a term of reproach to Christians, that the Evangelist, in a free and vivid interpretation of the Old Testament, could say, when contemplating the many passages in which the contempt the Messiah should be held in was declared, that Christ had been designated by the prophets as a Nazarene.² The full boldness and ingenuity of this declaration will be understood, when we consider that he wrote it for Jewish Christians, who were called Nazarenes, and perhaps also for Jews, who, in their prejudice, applied this name to Christians. He gave even Jews credit for not fastening upon such a sentence, in which all the prophets are said to concur, as a literal quotation from the prophetic writings.³

Though Jewish prejudice against Jesus was subsequently often fostered by the circumstance that He came from Nazareth, it was yet a master-stroke of divine wisdom that He should have grown up in that town. The retirement which concealed Him while He dwelt in one of the least noted districts, and

¹ This passage, taken in conjunction with Isa. liii. 2, might indeed occasion the Evangelist to find a special relation between the words Nezer and Nazareth. In both instances, the fresh life springing in silence, in one from the dry ground, in the other from contempt, form their single joint signification.

² *E.g.*, Ps. cxviii. 22; Zech. xi. 13.

³ [Alford leaves this 'an unsolved difficulty.' The very erudite discussion of Mill (pp. 334-342) seems, however, to shed all requisite light upon it. He advocates the view, that this title referred to His being a *branch* of the root of David, but that this required Him to grow up slowly and unseen as a tender plant; therefore He was brought up in Nazareth. 'A town of which this was to be the fate, and which, purely in consequence of Christ's early residence there, should furnish first to Him and then to His followers one of their most familiar titles,—a title first bestowed contemptuously, yet accepted and recognised afterwards with very different feelings,—may well be conceived an object of the divine predestination and care from the first. Fitly and providentially, therefore, was it so named, that when both our Lord and His followers were called Nazarenes, a title applied by the prophets both was thus unconsciously conferred.'—ED.]

among the least esteemed of the people, ensured the uninterrupted and original development of His unique life. It was as a miracle from heaven that this life was first to be displayed in the midst, and upon the high places, of Jewish popular life.

NOTE.

The often recurring assertion of modern criticism, that Matthew assumes that the parents of Jesus always lived in Bethlehem, before their settlement in Nazareth here mentioned, is supported, first, by the fact (chap. ii. 1), that the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem is spoken of without any previous mention of the journey of the parents. But since he had already spoken of Mary and Joseph in the first chapter, it might have been expected that the supposed assumption, with respect to their dwelling, would have come to light there, if it had really existed; while the fact of his not mentioning Bethlehem till he relates the birth of Jesus, seems rather to testify that he had in view another place than the ordinary abode of the parents. His reason for not naming the latter may be explained by the intention of his Gospel. He would not unnecessarily state anything which might add to the difficulties of Jewish Christians. Hence he does not name Nazareth till the passage in which he is obliged to do so, and where he can appeal to a decided motive, and a divine direction. That Mary and Joseph had formerly dwelt at Nazareth, is, in this passage (chap. ii. 23), a merely accessory circumstance. It is worthy of observation, that the words, *He shall be called a Nazarene*, must be referred to Joseph, if the passage is interpreted in a strictly literal manner. But since all are agreed that the sentence refers to Jesus, it may be asked whether the change of subject takes place with the quotation, or before. At all events, it is in accordance with the whole passage, to believe that the Evangelist had the Messiah in view, in the words *καὶ ἔλθὼν κατ' ὥκησε*, even though he does not formally say so.

SECTION XI.

THE FULFILMENTS.

(Matt. i. and ii.)

That the whole christological development of the ancient æon was fulfilled in Christ as the Prince of the new æon, that He was Himself the actual fulfilment of every exalted aspiration and effort that had preceded Him, is a doctrine announced by each and all of the apostles and Evangelists.

But a most intimate relation must prevail between the first beginnings and the perfection of the development of any definite life; it is but natural that the blossom and consummation of such development should be announced by frequent and most striking preludes. All the significant beginnings in the history of any celebrated life, will recur with increased force and ideality during the course of its development, and at length they will celebrate their fulfilment in the perfection of the maturity of this definite organic life.

When Christian Rome, in the days of its purely patriarchal rule in the West, poured forth the dawn of Christian civilisation over the mass of nations enveloped in the night of heathen darkness, then were fulfilled the great things anticipatively sung by the poets, of the eternal city.

When Luther affixed his theses to the castle church of Wittenberg, then was fulfilled, preliminarily at least, the inspired call with which Arminius had invoked the heroes of Germany against the world-wide supremacy of Rome.

But the relation and similarity between beginning, middle, and end, are not only displayed in broad, general features, but often far more wonderfully in separate, nay, in very special particulars. Natural philosophers have long known this great law of life; it is beginning to dawn upon historians; even theologians will have to acquaint themselves with it. When this is the case, many of the unfortunate critical remarks on significant references between the Old and New Testaments, will, at all events, come to nothing.

When the Evangelist Matthew was led, both by his own

turn of mind and his vocation, to contemplate and exhibit, with the greatest distinctness, the fulfilment of the christological beginnings of the Old Testament in the life of Jesus, it could not escape his penetrating glance, that the general fulfilment of the divine-human life in Christ was surrounded by many particular fulfilments, that the corolla was adorned with a rich wreath of flower-leaves. This was not merely his peculiar way of viewing it, still less a weakness of rabbinical exegesis. Even John was acquainted with this vital law, that the prelude reappears in the completion. He saw, *e.g.*, the speaking circumstance, that not a bone of the crucified Saviour, the anti-type of the paschal lamb, was broken. In both cases, too, this happened from the same reason: it was during the world's midnight hour, and under violent excitement of mind, that the sacrifice took place; it was no time for the performance of customary ceremonies or usages. Matthew then found the history of Christ's infancy rich in such prophetic features. In the birth of the Redeemer, the true Immanuel, of the Virgin, he rightly saw (Matt. i. 22, 23) the fulfilment of that prophetic scene in Isaiah (Isa. vii. 14), in which the birth of the son of a virgin mother, and the circumstance that she should call his name Immanuel, was, as we have already seen, held forth to king Ahaz as a sign of deliverance. The birth of Christ was the fulfilment of this scene in a threefold respect: the virginity of the mother, the heroic courage and redeeming love, and the consecration of the new-born child to be a sign and assurance of deliverance, but also, especially, the entire uniqueness of these three typical incidents were in this case perfect. With a free view of its meaning does the Evangelist quote also the passage in which Micah (v. 1) had announced the theocratic glory of Bethlehem. He, as well as the Jewish scribes, rightly applies it to the birth of Christ at Bethlehem. These words pointed out, not merely as a typical, but as a conscious prophecy, that the Messiah would be born at Bethlehem. Nay, this passage is a key to other passages whose reference is more obscure. The Governor of Israel is here designated as Him *whose goings forth or beginnings*¹ have been from of old, and from everlasting; therefore, as *the essential fulfilment*. When

Matthew was contemplating the flight of the parents of Jesus to Egypt, for the preservation of the Holy Child, and their return thence (chap. ii. 15), not only did the saying of Hosea (Hos. xi. 1)—Out of Egypt have I called My son—wherein God is stating His relation to the infancy of the people of Israel—appear to him highly significant; but also the actual similarity, that the typical son, the nation, in which the true Son was enclosed as the essence of its being, was called out of Egypt, and that now the true Son of God, with whom even the deliverance of the typical one recurred, should be called out of the same country. He even saw the recurrence and awful fulfilment of what was terrible in the history of Israel, when the prince who sat on David's throne slew the children of Bethlehem in order to destroy that great Son of David, who, according to promise, was to be Israel's Saviour and Deliverer. This occurrence recalled to his mind the terrible ruin of his nation, and the sad delusion of the reigning house. It had once, indeed, seemed to the prophet Jeremiah, when he saw in the Spirit the children of Israel led captive to Babylon, as though Rachel, their ancestress, were rising from her tomb in Rama to bewail her unhappy children, as though the lamentation of a spirit were resounding in heart-breaking tones upon the tops of the mountains; but Matthew felt that this incident, the slaughter of the children, was sadder than even that, that the troubles of his nation had now reached their climax, and that its faithful ancestress had now more reason than ever to be disturbed in her grave, and to lift up her voice in lamentation for her children. Such, however, is the Evangelist's spiritual liberty in his view of the relations between the Old and New Testaments, that he forms expressions according to actual circumstances, and reads sayings in the prophets which no literalist, but only a discerning child of the theocratic spirit, could read in them. Jesus grows up in Nazareth—the Messiah, the heir of all the promises, in that despised corner of Galilee—what a heavy cross to Jewish pride! Well, thinks Matthew, I find this despised origin, which obscures the Messiah to the carnal eye, pointed out in the prophets, in the rod that is to spring from the roots of Jesse, and elsewhere, so clearly that I am certain the prophets have, in the spirit of the words, declared that he shall be called a Nazarene. In a word, he meets the Nazarene

everywhere in the writings of the prophets. So practical an eye, looking upon the life of Jesus, could not but behold it richly adorned with fulfilments of Old Testament christological notions of every kind.

NOTE.

Having pointed out the general notion of these prophecies, it would be needless to dwell further on that exegetical treatment of the passages in question, which depends upon a misconception of the organic nature of prophecy.

SECTION XII.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF JESUS.

(Luke ii.)

Jesus was, and remained, a Nazarene till He was over thirty years of age. Hence He passed the greater part of His glorious life in retirement. It is a testimony to the infinite delicacy and secrecy of His divine greatness, to that revealing concealment of true majesty, which can escape the vulgar eye in broad daylight, that no Nazarene was so struck by His appearance as to become the Evangelist of His youth; but it is, at the same time, also a testimony to the dull state of popular life in Nazareth. The only trustworthy information we possess concerning Christ's development, is probably derived from the reminiscences of Mary. Thus the whole of our Lord's youthful life is covered by a general obscurity; while the one history which Luke has preserved in the narrative of the occurrence of His twelfth year, sheds the only ray which penetrates this darkness, a ray shining, on the one side, as far as the birth of Jesus, and on the other, as His baptism in Jordan.

Situate between the heights of the miraculous birth of Christ, and the solemnization of the perfection of His Messianic consciousness by the testimony of God and the recognition of John the Baptist, only such an incident as that communicated could

be in keeping ; a sun-enlightened peak, corresponding in its brightness and sublimity with those heights, and displaying by its features and style that it belongs to the same mountain chain.

The Evangelist Luke first gives us a general sketch of the development of Jesus : ‘The child grew and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom ; and the grace of God was upon Him.’ He then exhibits this development of Jesus in a most speaking fact.

The history of Jesus at twelve years of age represents His whole development. It is the characteristic act of His boyhood, the revelation of His youthful life,—a reflection of the glory of His birth, a token of His future heroic course. It exhibits the childhood of His ideality, and therefore the ideality of childhood in general.

When Jewish boys were twelve years old, they accompanied their kinsfolk to the great festivals at Jerusalem, and were called by a great name : Children of the Thorah, of the Law. Hence the parents of Jesus took Him with them as soon as He had reached this stage of life. When the festival was over, they returned among the Galilean company to Nazareth. But the child remained behind in Jerusalem. The parents first missed their Son when they took up their quarters for the night, after the first day’s journey, and found Him again, after three days’ anxious search, in the temple.

But how was it possible for them, and especially for Mary, to have been thus separated for three days from the child ? A single moment would be sufficient for such a contingency—a moment in which the young eagle unconsciously lost sight of His mother ; while she, the dependent wife, who was with Joseph and his relations, followed in the beaten track, and, under the supposition that her child would also remain in the company of the Galilean travellers, suffered Him to disappear from her immediate circle.

Mary has been reproached with this incident. But this has resulted from want of appreciating its serious, nay sad, significance. Mary was placed under domestic and family ties which exercised a power over her. The bloom of her inner life was of a New Testament character ; while, as a Jewess, she was rooted, by both duty and custom, in the Old Testament.

Thus was Mary, who once more in after days betrayed, in presence of her holy Son, traces of womanly weakness, and de-

pendence on Joseph's family (Mark iii. 31), carried forward by the rules of the Nazarene travellers; while the child—He knew not how—fell out of the train of boys, and went on, led by the Spirit, meditating, longing, attracted, and carried along by His own infinite thoughts, until He stood in the temple, in the midst of the Rabbis.

The separation of the mother and child did not therefore require much time. The pilgrims marched in companies or parties, which were again divided into separate bands. The parents of Jesus had seen the band of boys formed, and supposed that their Son had set off with it, according to custom. This mistake of a moment was sufficient to separate them from Him for three days. It was not till the end of the first day's journey that they could miss Him, when seeking Him at the common resting-place among His companions. The second day was occupied in returning. On the third, they found Him in the temple.

They were, however, in the highest degree surprised, nay amazed, to find the child in such a situation. He was sitting in the midst of a circle of Rabbis, listening to their instructions, and questioning them. A circle of wondering listeners surrounded Him; they were astonished at His understanding and answers.

But how could Jesus come into this connection with the Rabbis? We are informed that the pupils of the Rabbis were not suffered to sit in the presence of their teachers till a period subsequent to this.¹ This information is, however, regarded as doubtful. They suffered this unknown boy to sit in their midst. He was even permitted to question them, and thus to use an agency which might easily be converted into teaching, and which on this occasion probably became a difficult test to the Rabbis. The Rabbis of our days would not perhaps have suffered this; but the Rabbis of those days had not yet lost all feeling for the

¹ Comp. Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit der evang. Geschichte*, p. 217. Even if this information should be regarded as correct, it would cast no difficulty upon the passage. It would rather prove that etiquette, with respect to scholastic deportment in the schools of the Rabbis, was, in the days of Jesus, in a state of transition. If it subsequently became a rule that scholars should sit, why should it not now have taken place exceptionally, in the case of a very promising boy who was not yet a scholar, and whom perhaps the Rabbis might hope to obtain, to make Him an honour to Phariseism?

prophetic spirit, though they were fast stiffening into the death of formalism. They might well remember the boys Joseph, Samuel, and David, when they met with an unusually gifted boy. Besides, they might have been very glad to obtain distinguished pupils. At all events, these Rabbis suffered themselves to be for the moment carried away by the glorious and marvellous boy. The genius of the new human race overcame these heroes of ancient etiquette. Their better Israelite and human feelings made them for the moment delighted with the intelligent and inquiring boy, and they made Him sit in their midst.¹ He listened to and questioned them, giving a wholesome agitation to their scholastically formed and settled opinions by the expression of His vigorous and childlike thoughts.²

It was thus that His parents found Him. Joseph was truly concerned for the Holy Child who had been entrusted to him ; but one can easily understand that he would feel, in a still greater degree, a great and decided reverence for the Rabbis in the temple at Jerusalem. How many a time may he not, more or less, have lost sight of the future divine hero in the poor and often silent boy? And now he finds Him in the midst of the doctors of Jerusalem, perhaps unconsciously pressing upon them both strongly and sharply the great questions of the inner life of religion. He was amazed at the sight, as was Mary also. It is quite consistent with the actual relations between Christ and His parents, that they should not have been able to keep pace with Him in spiritual matters. Yet every incident in which they saw Him on the steep path of life suddenly looking down upon them from a dizzy overhanging height, must have the

¹ Strauss, vol. i. 310, expresses the view, that the sitting on the ground, which Paul designates (Acts xxii. 3) as the respect of a pupil to a teacher, forms a contradiction to this sitting of Jesus in the midst of the doctors. Why should it be impossible to sit on the ground in the midst of a circle of seats? Moreover, we may probably grant to these Rabbis sufficient homage for the genius of the boy to induce them to offer Him a seat. Schöttgen seats Him on a little throne ; it is questionable whether he does not give the Rabbis credit for too much. Others will not suffer Him to sit quietly on the floor, but disturb Him for the sake of rabbinical etiquette. We may at least claim for Him a little stool.

² Jewish Rabbis could perhaps most easily answer the inquiry, whether the questioning of the boy implies teaching, properly so called, and whether a mass of difficulties against the historical statement do not arise, from a rabbinical point of view.

more struck and surprised them, inasmuch as He was so thoroughly humble and submissive, so silent concerning the wonders of His inner life in His intercourse with them. If we cannot but find in the disposition of Joseph a secret complaisance in the boy's elevation, we may still more imagine what a terror of joy took possession of Mary. But how did she penetrate beyond the court of the women? and how came it that she anticipated her husband, and was the first to speak in presence of the Rabbis? Fortunately these difficulties have, as yet, escaped our critics. How vivid are these touches! The anxious mother is the first to press forward. Joseph, however, has not yet grown to the comprehension of this scene; he maintains a reverential silence. Mary asks the boy: 'Son, why hast Thou thus dealt with us? behold, thy father and I have sought Thee, sorrowing.' And He replies, 'How is it that ye sought Me? wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?' And they understood not the saying which He spake unto them.

The boy asked, with most genuine naïveté, 'Could you then seek Me? Did you not know that I am at home here?'¹ The temple on Moriah is to Him still identical with His Father's house, the interpretation of the Old Testament with His Father's word, and intercourse with the Rabbis with His Father's presence. This place still exercises upon His religious feeling the full power of a heavenly home; and He cannot understand that His parents should have set off, and then, when they missed Him, not immediately have sought Him here. At all events, He expresses the whole theology of His own nature, yet not in the form of matured consciousness, but in the truest type of the dawning notions of genuine childhood. Time had escaped Him in the happy hours He had spent there; but He now listens and questions from the stand-point of His parents. He does not desire to excuse Himself for having forgotten the whole world in His Father's house; but He allows Himself to be informed of the anxiety they had suffered, because they did not know of His doings in the temple. Mary speaks of His father Joseph, but He speaks of the irresistible drawing of His Father in heaven. It is the dawning feeling of that sonship which was His alone—a feeling still enveloped, however, in the bud of childlikeness, which expresses, without intending it, the great

¹ Compare Stier's *Words of the Lord Jesus* i. 21 (Clark's Tr.).

contrast between the earthly and the heavenly father. The consciousness of His heavenly Father's omnipresence is still enveloped in the bud of childlike devotion, which seeks the Father in His temple; and His gradual self-reflection upon the depths of the divine life within Him is still veiled under the childlike simplicity with which, impelled by sincere confidence and thirst after knowledge, He proposes His questions to the fathers of Jewish theology.

But the test of a childlike purity corresponding with the presentiment of His great destiny, lies in the fact that He should, when bidden by His parents to depart for Nazareth, so immediately leave the place where He had plunged so deeply into the nature of His Father, and had, in this experience, comprehended His own; the place of which He had but just said: It is here that I am at home. He entered into their ways of life, and freely followed their guidance. Certainly the saying, He was subject to them, means fully as much as this; and how happy must He be esteemed in His humble obedience! Under the shadow of the temple of Jerusalem, He must either have become a disciple of the Pharisees, or rather, since this was an impossibility, He would have reached His goal too early by opposing the pharisaic spirit. In Nazareth, on the contrary, another of His Father's houses—the greatness, the sacredness of nature—was opened to Him, for the development of His consciousness. Here He could search the Scriptures without the obscuring glosses of the Rabbis; instead of intercourse with spiritually dead scribes, could commune with the ever-living spirits of the prophets; while Mary His mother, the chosen one, who pondered in her heart all that befell Him, was more to Him than all the priests of the temple. She beheld with maternal delight, how He grew in wisdom and stature, and in favour both with God and man. Though she often sank below that high and perfect state of inspiration in which she had brought forth her holy Son, yet, according to the prevailing feature of her life, she must have risen towards Him, when He went down to Nazareth with her.

If the child had not expressed His ideal of continually dwelling in the temple, He would have been enslaved by the force of Old Testament customs. If, on the contrary, He had insisted on maintaining this ideal, in opposition to the higher

ideality of following the divine will, in the performance of domestic duty, He would have trodden the path of self-will. Both were impossible. His free submission is a prelude to the great prayer in Gethsemane. Jesus there, according to the true meaning of the prayer, once more asks of His Father, whether the ideal of a Messiah free from suffering, and dwelling upon Zion, were a possibility; but He finds the answer in the depths of His own breast, and becomes again, with perfect and free submission, the Nazarene, even to death upon the cross.

We have pointed out, in what has been already advanced, the education under which the development of Jesus took place. The notions, that Jesus perhaps picked up somewhat of the far-famed wisdom of Egypt, during His flight thither, while still a sportive child—that He was secretly a disciple of the Essenes,—as well as other similar conjectures, have their foundation in the general tendency of ‘Philisterism,’ to explain the very highest kind of life by mere scholastic reasoning, to attribute the greatest human originality to a compound of the effects of lesser minds. It has been already shown, that the Essenes were anything but genuine Israelites. The Messiah might appear, be crucified, and die in the midst of His people, without their appreciating or observing Him from their schismatic corner.

If education is looked upon as an influence upon the life of the scholar, by which his character receives many elements from the circle of ideas and the reflections of his teacher, and by which his views are variously modified, we may unhesitatingly declare of Jesus, that His healthy nature totally withstood all education of this kind. Himself so powerfully and purely original, He was incapable of taking into His nature false or obscure impressions even of theology and history. It was only the objective and the actual which could find an entrance into His mind: what was false rebounded from the elasticity of His heavenly-minded moral nature, and then appeared before Him objectively, as one of the world’s delusions, as a medium for perfecting His knowledge of the world.

But if we view education as a means of unfolding the inner nature of the scholar by appropriate influences and communications, as the organic excitement of his development, and as feeding his inner life with such a measure of the facts of the outer world as the exigencies of a healthy vital process of assi-

milation require, no one enjoyed a richer education and cultivation than Jesus.

As Luther once bestowed upon a bird the title of Doctor, because it had taught him confidence, so far rather did Jesus receive from the fowls of heaven and the lilies of the field, the most instructive and most cheering of Heaven's teachings. All nature became to Him a transparent symbol of eternal truth, the developed counterpart, the mirror of that divine fulness which was discovering itself within Him; and He found on the hills of Galilee a glorious sanctuary, which compensated Him for the courts of the temple.

Even everyday life was a school of instruction to Him. The price of a sparrow in the market was connected in His mind with the highest interests of the human soul. He beheld all things in their twofold relations; that is, according to their import in the world, and their import in the government and mind of God.

In the stupidity of the people, in all the misunderstandings and misinterpretations, which the manifestation of His purity could not fail to elicit, the dark side of the world, the deep corruption of the human race, was early made manifest to Him. Very early must He, after a glance at Israel and the world, have turned with a sigh to His Father in the sense of those words of gloomy foreboding: *a dark spirit runs through this house.*

The Old Testament offered Him the same solution which He found in His own mind. 'The Scriptures testify of Me,' said He. He found their utterances identical with His own consciousness, nay, even parallel with its development. Their christological development reached its climax in His own life: He was Himself their last word, their key. The progress of His development was a progress through the stages of their life; hence He penetrated their deepest meaning, as proved, *e.g.*, by His explanation of the brazen serpent, of the announcement of God as the God of Abraham, and His masterly quotation of many Old Testament passages against the Pharisees. The Old Testament was to Him the fullest prophecy of His own life.

Undoubtedly the journeys which Christ annually made to Jerusalem after His twelfth year, had great influence in the development of His consciousness. The acquaintance of the boy with the doctors seems not to have increased from year to year.

His first visit to Jerusalem was sufficient to enable Him to penetrate the whole corruption of the existing temple-system.

The life of His mother Mary, however, only needed to be understood as His mind could understand it, to appear as a bright picture of a happy life in God. His intercourse with her was the most refined and noblest means of promoting His development. Her humility, love, and faith appeared before Him in a mature, though not a perfect aspect, and therefore could not but exert a powerful influence upon His soul. She was to Him also in a special sense a type of the elect, of that higher and nobler humanity which the Father had given to Him; hence a type of His Church. Certainly the kindly intercourse between Christ and His mother Mary, was the noblest element of His human education and development. Who can portray the great and deep joy of this connection, the words of mutual help and encouragement which could not but be uttered in the intercourse of these hearts, or the unspeakably acute sorrow which must have burned like fire at a white heat in both, when Mary, in weaker moments, could not understand the faith of her Son, when the Jewess opposed the Christian in her breast? In decisive moments, Christ placed her in a high position. Under the rule of His Spirit, she was held sacred in the youthful days of the Gospel, in the youthful days of the Church. But He could not have given a more touching or lovelier testimony to the character of her mind, than He uttered from the cross in His legacy of love, a love infinitely abundant even in the agonies of death—the legacy by which He made John her son, and her his mother. But though Mary might lead the Lord to the entrance of the Holy of Holies, no intercourse could be so promotive of His inner life as intercourse with His Father.

The perfection of His intercourse with the Father, whether displayed in the entire unreserve of face-to-face dialogue, or in those monologues in which His very soul was poured forth, this vitality of prayer casts a bright ray upon the holy night of His childhood, making it clear to us, that in proportion to His development, He could not but be found in His Father's house, His Father's bosom, in His love and presence, nay, could not but find His Father in His whole being. His whole life was developed in God—as one prayer of infinite depth—one deep sigh for the world's salvation—one loud hallelujah for the saving love mani-

festing itself in Him—one continuous amen of obedience, and surrender to the guidance of His Father. Thus was His development in the life of prayer perfected.

It might then well seem, to modest minds, an infinitely difficult task to define exactly the degree of development which such a mind might attain at the age of twelve. The observations of those who have found the boy placed at too great an elevation, have been met by examples of precociously great minds; the remark has also been made, that an Oriental child of twelve would equal a Western one of fifteen in degree of development; but the opponents of the historic Gospel have not given up their objections.¹ Though they can hardly recognise a developed Church Christology in the sayings of Christ during the ministrations of His manhood, they find it, strange to say, in the expression: I must be in what is My Father's. They think that a child of twelve could not have spoken so theologically.² An unprejudiced consideration, however, of the whole expression, shows that the morning dew of childhood still lies upon every word; such complete naiveté, that a sophist could subsequently adduce it in support of the opinion, that this boy spoke in too childish a manner to represent the Prince of mankind at the age of twelve. How indefinitely obscure is the saying: I must be in those (things, places, or affairs) that are My Father's (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου)! How childlike is the assumption, that this being in the Father's sphere was identical with a sojourn in the temple! And how sudden is the transition from the genuine Zionite ideal, to unlimited obedience! In such alternations of

¹ Compare my essay *Ueber den geschichtlichen Charakter der kanonischen Evangelien*, pp. 120 ff.—Tholuck, *die Glaubwürdigkeit*, p. 221.

² Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 313. 'We might take this designation of God as τοῦ πατρός indefinitely, as showing that He would represent God as the Father of all men, and only in this sense as His also.'—This is said to be the description of a religious feeling.—'But not only are we forbidden so to understand it by the appended μοῦ, which in this sense would have been (as in Matt. vi. 9) ἡμῶν, but chiefly by the fact, that the parents of Jesus did not understand this saying, etc. But that a consciousness of His Messiahship should have been manifested in Jesus at twelve years of age, etc.' The writer seems to have no notion that there is a form of the inner life called anticipation, a mid-region between unconsciousness and manifested consciousness; that this form of life is peculiar to mature childhood, and shows itself in gifted children in significant expressions, containing more than the speakers know with certainty.

frame, we recognise a genuine childlike nature, though certainly a nature coming up to the standard of ideal childhood, and representing, in its bounding freedom, the young lion ; in its swift obedience, the tender lamb.

NOTES.

1. From the present history, we learn that the parents of Jesus generally went together to the Passover at Jerusalem. This certainty is derived from the words : His parents. But it does not follow that Joseph might not have frequented the other great annual festivals. It is probable that Jesus had frequently gone up to the feasts at Jerusalem before His public appearance, and that the intercourse with pilgrims, priests, and scribes, which such journeys involved, was undoubtedly one great element of His development, and of preparation for His ministry.

2. And when He was twelve years old (*ὅτε ἐγένετο ἑτῶν δώδεκα*), says the Evangelist. Strauss here alternately uses the expressions : in His twelfth year, and : Jesus was twelve years old. Neander says He had entered His twelfth year. This inaccuracy must be avoided. If Jesus were born in the early months of the year, He had probably entered His thirteenth year.

3. The text gives us occasion to imagine a distinct grouping of the pilgrim caravans, and indeed such a one as enforced the separation of a boy from his parents on the return journey. This leads to the view of a separate company of boys.

4. Strauss makes the following objection to the early development of Jesus, related in the present narrative (vol. i. 313): ' For, though the consciousness of a more subjective vocation, as of poet, artist, etc., in which all depends upon the individual being gifted with early susceptibility, might possibly very soon manifest itself ; yet an objective vocation, in which actual occurrences form a chief factor, such as the vocation of statesman, general, reformer of religion, could hardly become so clear, even in the most gifted individual ; because such a knowledge of given circumstances is needed for it, as longer observation and more matured experience alone could afford. But it is to the latter kind that a vocation to be the Messiah belongs, etc.' The same writer also says, in his article, *Vergängliches und Bleibendes in Christenthum*, p. 109 ff., A late penetrating observer rightly

finds a main difference between human natures and endowments, in the circumstance that some feel an impulse and vocation to go out of themselves, and objectively to exhibit that which lives within them in works of art or science, in deeds of war or peace; while others, shut up in themselves, strive to make their inner nature unanimous with itself, to exercise, to cultivate its various powers, and thus to form their own life to a rich harmonious work of art.—Now Christ belonged in the fullest and highest sense to this (latter) class of natures.—Accustomed as we are to be astonished at the rapid turns of ‘criticism,’ we can but be astonished once more. So then, in the former, as well as in the latter work, the author gives the same classification of the great minds of the world’s history. But in the one, he places Christ in the class of those who have an objective, and in the other, of those who have a more subjective vocation. By this flagrant contradiction he gains a double advantage. He can first (presumptively at least) apply the theory of the objective vocation of Christ, as an argument against the development of Jesus at twelve years of age. But then he can afterwards, by connecting Him with the geniuses of the world, bring the Christ of more subjective gifts into a class which, in some measure, secures Him from being mixed up with the often impure ‘heroes of war and politics,’ and thus weaken the reproofs he might have expected.

Bruno Bauer, speaking against the early development of Jesus, says, vol. i. p. 65, ‘A twelve-years-old boy is a twelve-years-old boy in every region under heaven.’¹

¹ [In some recent ‘Lives of Jesus,’ notice has been taken of His bodily appearance. This has from the first been matter of dispute; some of the fathers maintaining, that if the prophecy of Isaiah (chap. liii.) was fulfilled in Him, His appearance must have been far from beautiful or attractive. Others denied that any such inference was necessary. The various opinions have been collected and conveniently arranged by Le Nourry in his *Dissertationes in Clem. Alex.* (Dis. i. iv. art. 4). The traditions of supernaturally originated pictures are some centuries too late to claim consideration. The interesting fragment, however, preserved from very ancient times, and claiming to be the description of a contemporary (the proconsul Lentulus), embodies the leading features of that idea of our Lord’s appearance which the greatest painters have adopted or conceived. ‘There appeared in these our days a man of great virtue named Jesus Christ, who is yet living amongst us, and of the Gentiles is accepted for a prophet of truth, but his own disciples call him the Son of God. He raiseth the dead, and cureth all manner of

SECTION XIII.

THE FAMILY RELATIONS OF JESUS.

Joseph, the foster-father of Jesus, must undoubtedly have died between the first journey of Jesus to Jerusalem and His first entrance upon His public ministry,—that is, between His twelfth and thirtieth years. For on that journey he was still accompanying Mary; while in the history of Christ's public life he is nowhere met with, not even at the marriage of Cana. More definite information concerning the time of his departure is hardly to be obtained. No artisan ever performed so great things as he. He is the prince of craftsmen; unless, indeed, Christ, of whom tradition says that He worked in wood, and whom even the Nazarenes called (according to Mark vi. 3) the carpenter, were so Himself. But we shall return to this question.

After Joseph's death, Mary was not left alone with Jesus. His brethren are often spoken of in the Gospels,¹ and in a connection which plainly shows that they formed one family with Mary and Joseph. According to John ii. 12, His brethren accompanied Him, together with Mary and His disciples, from Nazareth to Capernaum. They are placed before His disciples, for Jesus had not as yet assumed any public character. Mary and His brethren seem to have accompanied Him in the character of His domestic circle. Still greater prominence is given to this circle in the scene (Mark iii. 20), where He is occupied diseases. A man of stature, somewhat tall and comely, with a very reverend countenance, such as beholders may both love and fear; his hair the colour of a filbert full ripe, somewhat curling or waving about his shoulders; his forehead plain and delicate; his face without spot or wrinkle; his beard thick and short; His eyes gray, clear, and quick; in reproving awful, in admonishing courteous, in speaking very modest and wise. None have ever seen him laugh, but many have seen him weep—a man for his beauty surpassing the children of men.' This extract will be found in Clark's *Travels*, vol. iv. 177; or Lord Lindsay's *Christian Art*, vol. i. p. 77. In connection with this, should be read the wise counsel of Augustine regarding the use to be made of ideas of our Lord's personal appearance (*De Trinitate* viii. 3-8). —ED.]

¹ Matt. xii. 46, xiii. 55; Mark iii. 31, vi. 3; John ii. 12, vii. 3, 5; Luke viii. 19; Acts i. 14; i. Cor. ix. 5; Gal. i. 19.

with the multitudes in the full activity of His ministry, and His adversaries are already opposing Him with undisguised malice. His friends, or His family (οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ), it is said, went out to lay hold on Him, for they said, He is beside Himself. Undoubtedly, these persons were the same of whom it is said, ver. 32, Thy mother and Thy brethren without seek for Thee.

In what relation, then, did Jesus stand to these brethren?

To answer this question is a perplexing task; since the hints which must decide it are but scantily given in the New Testament. The matter, too, which is difficult enough in itself, has been still further perplexed by various and opposing dogmatic prepossessions. From the midst of this confusion, however, four chief hypotheses appear.

The first explanation of the circumstance, supposes that these brethren of Jesus were His own brothers on the mother's side; sons of the marriage of Joseph and Mary, born after Jesus. The expression, brethren (ἀδελφοί), whose constant use in pointing out family connections, at all events, suffers us to infer brotherly relationship in a narrower sense, favours this view.¹ Besides, it is said (Matt. i. 25) of Mary, Joseph knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son; and (Luke ii. 7), She brought forth her first-born son. The remark on the connection between Joseph and Mary, seems to point to subsequent marital association; the appellation, her first-born son, seems to relate to brothers born subsequently. This view is especially favoured by Protestants, in opposition to the Romish veneration of Mary, and declaration of her perpetual virginity.

The opposite view understands by the brethren of Jesus His cousins. It arises from the general assumption, that the word *brother* was often used by the Hebrews in a wider sense, and consequently included the ἀνεψιός, the cousin or relation. It finds, however, a safer starting-point in the passage, John xix. 25. Here, according to the prevailing view of the passage, Mary the wife of Cleophas is represented as sister of Mary the mother of Jesus. We cannot, however, avoid considering the names Cleophas and Alpheus identical, when so pressing an

¹ This view has lately been defended with much skill and diligence by Ph. Schaf, in his essay, *das Verhältniss des Jakobus, Bruders des Herrn zu Jakobus Alphäe*, Berlin 1843.

occasion for doing so as this occurs.¹ For the same Mary is, in Matt. xxvii. 56, spoken of as the mother of James and Joses. Now, there was among the disciples one bearing the name of James the son of Alpheus, James the son of this Mary. But if Joses were his brother, as appears also from Mark xv. 40, we have already two of the names appearing in the list of Jesus' brethren. We have next to consider the circumstance, that the author of the Epistle of Jude calls himself the servant of Jesus Christ, the brother of James. He is undoubtedly the same who is mentioned by Luke in the apostolic catalogue, as Jude the brother of James. This James, however, cannot be James the Great, since he is always connected with his brother John. But if he were James the Less, Jude, as well as James and Joses, is also a son of Alpheus. Now the brethren of Jesus are called James, Joses,² Juda, and Simon (Mark vi. 3). If, then, we here introduce the information of Eusebius and Hegesippus, that Simeon, Bishop of Jerusalem, who suffered martyrdom under Trajan, was a son of Cleophas, we have four sons of Cleophas who bear the same names as the brethren of Jesus. Thus the brethren of Jesus were His cousins.

The third view is, that Joseph had been married before his espousal to Mary, and that it is the children of this marriage whom Matthew and Mark call the brethren of Jesus. This view is founded upon apocryphal legends. According to some of these legends,³ Joseph is said to have had a wife named Esha; according to others, Salome; and to have had by her four sons, James, Joses, Simon, and Juda, and two daughters, Esther and Thamar; according to others, Mary, and Salome, the mother of Zebedee's children. This opinion was defended by many fathers and theologians, especially by Origen and Grotius. It has been remarked against it, that it seems to have arisen from merely doctrinal prejudices, viz., for the sake of harmonizing the scriptural account of the brothers and sisters of Jesus with notions of the immaculate purity of Mary. But, at any rate, it

¹ Alphæus . . . a Joanne Κλωπᾶς appellatur. Hebraicum אֶלְפִּי a Matth. et Marco abjecta aspiratione, Ἀλφαιῶς efferebatur, ut Hagg. i. 1, אֶלְפִּי a LXX. Ἀγαίος, a Joanne Κλωπᾶς, π mutata in Κ, etc., redditur.—So Bretschneider's Lexicon.

² According to Lachmann's reading, Matt. xiii. 55, Ἰωσήφ.

³ Comp. Schaf, *das Verhältniss*, etc., p. 35.

explains, in a simple manner, on one hand, the family relationship of these four brethren to Jesus, and on the other, the circumstance that they nowhere appear in the Gospel in the intimate relation of own brethren to Him, and especially that the names of His sisters are not once mentioned.

Finally, the references in the Gospels, of James the Less to his father Alpheus, of Mary the wife of Cleophas to her sons James and Joses, of the Jude who wrote the Epistle bearing his name to James, have caused others to regard the four brethren of Jesus and their sisters as children of Mary the wife of Cleophas and of Joseph, through a Levirate marriage, for the purpose of raising up seed to the childless Cleophas, the brother of Joseph. Theophylact, among others, supported this view. This would very well explain why only James should be decidedly mentioned as the son of Alpheus, while the rest of the brethren and sisters of Jesus are not so described. But as Schaf rightly remarks, the absurdity and unfitness of a double marriage on Joseph's part, speaks against this view. In this case, Joseph would have been husband at the same time to the widow of his brother and to the mother of Jesus, for there seems no reason to suppose that he had separated from the latter.

Not wishing to bestow too large a space upon this question, we but briefly communicate the result of our view of the family relations of Jesus, accompanied by a statement of the reasons which have determined it.

That Mary lived after the birth of Jesus in marital intercourse with Joseph, in the stricter sense, seems to result from the passage cited. It cannot, however, be certainly concluded from it, since it only directly denies the fact of such intercourse having taken place before the birth of Christ.¹ The designation of her son as the first-born, seems to be an emphatic expression, by no means intended to point out that she afterwards had other sons. The Evangelist could not here have been thinking of these sons, if she had had them. The uniqueness of this child wholly filled his mind. Christ is the first-born of the new human race, or rather the prince-born of mankind, and of the world. Paul calls Him so (Col. i. 15), and why should not the Evan-

¹ [As Calvin says (*in loc.*), 'Vocatur primogenitus; sed non alia ratione nisi ut sciamus, ex virgine esse natum.'—ED.]

gelist also thus name Him in a New Testament sense? The evangelical expression concerning the birth of Christ runs thus in Luke:¹ ἔτεκε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον. With Vater we read αὐτῆς, and translate, she brought forth her son, who was her own, the first-begotten.

The Romish Church denies the sexual intercourse of the holy couple, in order to preach the perpetual virginity of Mary. Even Joseph is raised to the condition of perpetual virginity.² We do not entertain those doctrinal prejudices which require such a view; and for this reason, that the ethic notion of virginity stands higher with us than the physical. The view of virginity which cannot rise above the physical notion, has led to many coarse discussions and definitions. But though in this inquiry we may insist on laying special weight upon Mary's frame of mind, though we conceive that her state of heavenly inspiration raised her far above the region of matrimonial relations, yet we must not forget that Mary was the wife of Joseph. She was, according to a ratified engagement, dependent upon her husband's will.

But it would be only upon the strongest testimony that we could admit that Mary became the mother of other children after the birth of Christ. No doctrinal grounds, in a narrower sense, prepossess us against this admission, but religio-philosophical and physical considerations, which indeed indirectly form themselves into doctrinal ones, inasmuch as all views must terminate in one christological view. As a wife, Mary was subject to wifely obligations; but as a mother, she had fulfilled her destiny with the birth of Christ. The sacred organism of this woman, which had once contained the germ of the new humanity, which creative omnipotence had, by a stroke of heavenly influence, made to bring forth the manifestation of eternal life, was independent of the will of man and his fluctuations. And even for the very sake of nature's refinement, we cannot but imagine that this organism, which had borne the Prince of the new æon, would be too proudly or too sacredly disposed, to lend itself, after bringing forth the life of Christ, to the production of more common births for the sphere of the old æon.

¹ Lachmann has in Matt. the reading ἔτεκεν υἱόν.

² See Schaf, p. 88.

A glance, too, into the Gospel history, will convince us that it is very improbable that Jesus had younger brothers and sisters. It is usual for a spirit like His to carry along with it the younger members of a family. From their first breath, they are under the influence of his superior force of character. If, then, Jesus had had brethren younger than Himself, we might expect that they would have surrendered themselves to Him with enthusiasm, and not have given Him anxiety as dissentients. We find, however, exactly the reverse. The brethren of Jesus seem, with relation to Him, to have early taken up the position of decided Jews. Their unbelief, mentioned by John (chap. vii. 3, 6), has indeed been too much smoothed over. That they intended to deride Him, is indeed not to be imagined. They were probably unbelieving in a similar sense to those Jews who wanted to make Him a king (John vi. 15), *i.e.*, without submission to His self-determination, without obedience. They could not reconcile themselves to His rule of life, but wanted Him to realize their Messianic notions. Nor would younger own brothers of Jesus, and children of Mary, have brought Mary herself into a dissentient position, and have ventured to give themselves the appearance of acting in concert with His mother, in their desire to restrain Him in His activity. But if we accept the view that these brethren were, some of them at least, older than Jesus, we cannot fail to remember that journey from the Passover in which His parents missed the child Jesus. For they lost Him through their assumption that He was among His kinsfolk and acquaintances (*ἐν τοῖς συγγενέσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς γνωστοῖς*, Luke ii. 44). Here relations are certainly spoken of as distinct from friends and acquaintances, and indeed from boy-relatives; since, as has been shown, we must suppose a separate train of boys. These boys must have been older than twelve, since those who were younger were left at home. Since, then, we certainly know of the existence of brethren of Jesus, and have found occasion to suppose that some of them were older than He, we are obliged to conclude that they were either His half-brothers or cousins, for Mary had, in any case, no elder sons.

We now turn to the passage John xix. 25, to obtain information concerning the sister of Christ's mother. It is here said: There stood by the cross of Jesus, His mother, and His mother's, sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. Ac-

according to the usual interpretation, three women are here named, while the sister of Jesus' mother is further designated the wife of Cleophas. On the other hand, however, Wieseler offers another interpretation.¹ He points out, first, that the sentence may easily be so construed as to speak of four women: Mary the mother of Jesus, her sister, whose name is not stated, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene. He then supposes this unnamed sister to have been Salome, the mother of Zebedee's children. The arguments which he adduces in favour of this view, seem to us decisive. First, it is improbable that two sisters should both bear the name of Mary. Secondly, the statements of the two first Evangelists both lead to this view (Matt. xxvii. 56, comp. Mark xv. 40); Matthew saying that the mother of Zebedee's sons, and Mark that Salome was present at the crucifixion. John must at all events have been acquainted with this circumstance; and who could suppose that he would, in this passage, pass over his mother? But if he certainly has mentioned her, we can understand that he should maintain that same reserve of style with which he mentioned himself as the disciple whom Jesus loved. Thus also he designates his mother only in a periphrasis, by which he avoids pointing out his relation to her and mentioning her name. It is to this circumstance that we owe the information, that Salome was a sister of Mary, and that consequently James and John, the sons of Zebedee, must be considered the cousins of Jesus. From this relationship Wieseler explains the circumstance, that these two brethren should unite with their mother in asking for the first places in the kingdom of Christ (Matt. xx. 20-28; Mark x. 35-45). Even Christ's legacy on the cross, by which He delivered the care of Mary to John, becomes, according to Wieseler's remark, still more comprehensible, when the relationship here pointed out is assumed.²

But perhaps it is of more importance, that this relationship confirms also the relationship of the family of Jesus to

¹ Compare Wieseler's article, *Die Söhne Zebedäi, Vettern des Herrn*, in Ullmann and Umbreit's *Studien und Kritiken* for 1840, No. 3, p. 648.

² Finally, the author adduces, in favour of his hypothesis, the view of the Syrian Church. Hegesippus also, the oldest Church historian, who calls Cleophas a brother of Joseph, knew of the sisterly relationship between the wife of Cleophas and the mother of Jesus. For further proofs from apocryphal literature, see the above-named article, p. 681.

that of John the Baptist. It is among the Baptist's disciples that we first meet with the Apostle John. It is he who has preserved to us the most significant utterances of the Baptist concerning Jesus. As an intimate of John, he was present at his answer to the deputation sent to him from Jerusalem, and this circumstance might have been the means of his becoming acquainted with the family of the high priest. All this does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the theologic and christologic John must have been related to the Baptist; but when we learn elsewhere that Salome was a sister of Mary, and Mary a relation of Elisabeth, we obtain a view of a connection between these three families which may explain much.

We can then no longer esteem the sons of Alpheus as cousins of Jesus, on the supposition that the wife of Cleophas was a sister of Mary. Thus much, however, may be with certainty affirmed from a consideration of the group of women at the foot of the cross, that Mary the wife of Cleophas was very nearly related to the Lord and to His mother. But Hegesippus informs us, after Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 11), that Cleophas was a brother of Joseph. We have no positive reasons for rejecting this ancient historical testimony. We have already seen that many theologians have founded upon this information the hypothesis, that Joseph was own father to the children of this Mary the wife of Cleophas, by having occupied the place of his deceased brother. The objection to this view has already been stated.

We may then preliminarily consider these enigmatical brethren of Jesus as sons of Cleophas. They were merely His cousins (*ἀνεψιοί*), and not His brothers. Nay, they were no blood-relations at all, but cousins-in-law. How, then, did they come under the designation of brethren? In the simplest manner possible. Cleophas probably died while his children were still young. And this would cause Joseph, who was, we are informed, a just Israelite, to take in the widow and her children, and to adopt the latter. Since, however, Joseph died while Jesus was yet young, as many of these adopted brothers of Jesus, who might rightly be named His brethren, as were older than He, would properly become the heads of this Nazarene household. These young Jews might long maintain their own will against the younger brother, with whom they were only legally connected. As elder members of His family, they might even desire to have

Him under their direction, though their Jewish pride might already have rejoiced in His fame. Finally, such a Jewish family spirit might have prevailed among them, that even Mary, a dependent woman, might have been so far led away, as, on one occasion, to join with them in desiring to arrest her Son's course. This took place during the second year of Christ's ministry. Jesus was already obliged to send His disciples to Jerusalem alone, having first definitely chosen and set apart twelve. He already numbered two of His brethren among them, though the circumstance that they are mentioned last in every catalogue of the apostles, shows that they were, at any rate, among the last who entered the company.¹ They might nevertheless have attempted to check His course, as Peter subsequently did, when Jesus was about to enter upon His sufferings. Christ's reproof of the untimely interference of His family by the words, 'Behold My mother and My brethren,' etc. (Mark iii. 34), must be compared with the saying with which He rebuked Peter, 'Get thee behind Me, Satan' (Matt. xvi. 23), if we would recognise the identity of the two positions, and, at the same time, comprehend that the brethren of Jesus, though still, when viewed in the light of the subsequent pentecostal season, unbelieving, *i.e.* self-willed and gloomy, could nevertheless be apostles. They were probably, in part at least, men of strong, firm natures.² Judas seems, in his unbending firmness, to have been the leading spirit of this Nazarene family, on which account, perhaps, the surname Lebbeus or Thaddeus, the courageous, the free-hearted, seems to have been given him.³ The Epistle of Jude needs only to be read, to recognise such a character in every line. In the school of Jesus, respect was had to the real nobility of peculiar gifts, even though they often manifested themselves in peculiar errors; hence the sons of Zebedee were named the sons of thunder, Simon called Peter, while Jude received the characteristic name of Lebbeus or Thaddeus. It is therefore now clear to us, that the

¹ James the Less seems to have received this surname, with reference to the earlier entrance of the other James among the band of disciples.

² Comp. Winer's *R. W. B.*, Art. Judas Lebbaeus.

³ The expression, John vii. 4, is quite calculated to exhibit a character still biassed by carnal courage, and inclined to see timidity in Christ's prudence. The same kind of expression, though ennobled, recurs John xiv. 21, here the decided utterance of this Judas.

remark concerning the unbelief of the brethren of Jesus is not opposed to the fact of their being included among the apostles, as related by the Evangelist, especially when we reflect that this family spirit of opposition to the Messianic progress of Christ might have reached its climax in the persons of Joses and Simon. But before regarding our conclusions as established, we must glance at those passages in the apostolic epistles which have been thought opposed to them.

It seems from the Epistle to the Galatians (chap. i. 19, ii. 9 and 12), that a James was, together with Peter and John, held in the very highest esteem by the Church at Jerusalem, nay, that he represented, in a peculiar sense, the Jewish-Christian party. Now it has been supposed, that we may infer from the passages in question, that this James, as a brother of the Lord, is distinguished from the apostles. In conformity with this notion, some translate Gal. i. 19, 'I saw no other apostle than Peter, but yet I saw James.' This is, however, at all events, a forced view; a simpler one leads to the translation, 'other apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.'¹ And the Epistle to the Galatians in general, when more strictly considered, offers evidence that this James could be no other than the Apostle James, the son of Alphaeus. In its second chapter, the Apostle Paul designates him as one of the three apostolic men who were regarded as pillars of the Church. He appears to have been that apostolic individual upon whom the opponents of St Paul most relied. These opponents denied

¹ [It has very commonly and carelessly been stated, that in the New Testament, *εἰ μὴ* uniformly preserves its exceptive use; and even with so accurate a grammarian as Ellicott, we find these words (*Hist. Lect.* p. 98, note): 'That Gal. i. 19 cannot be strained to mean, "I saw none of the apostles, but I saw the Lord's brother," seems almost certain from the regularly exceptive use which *εἰ μὴ* appears always to preserve in the New Testament.' But that *εἰ μὴ* does not always preserve its exceptive use, but is commonly used as an adversative, must appear unquestionable to any one who looks at Matt. xxiv. 36, Luke iv. 26 and 27, and Matt. v. 13; passages where the exceptive use of the expression is *simply impossible*. If an instance in classical Greek be desired, such will be found in Aristoph. *Eq.* 184. Mitchell, in his edition of that play (*in loc.*), remarks, 'In many cases, the French expression *au contraire* seems better to express its sense.' His further conjectures regarding the use of this formula are well worth considering. So far, then, as the use of *εἰ μὴ* goes, the controverted passage is susceptible of either rendering.—Ed.]

the apostolical authority of St Paul. They reproached him with having no historical mission (Gal. i. 1), with not being appointed by Christ Himself, as the other apostles had been. They thus opposed his ecclesiastical legitimacy. Now it is in the highest degree improbable, that these early zealots for the succession theory should have opposed to St Paul the name of one who, in the sense in which they rejected Paul, was himself no legitimate apostle.¹ The spirit of the Church at Jerusalem had not indeed become so carnal as to number one who was not an apostle among the apostles, merely on account of his brotherhood with Christ. In this case, James would also have been an apostle. But if James were an apostle, besides being a brother of the Lord, this latter fact would much enhance his credit, and the Jewish party might lay an emphasis on this appellation with a view of depressing the credit of Paul.

On careful consideration, then, of the inner meaning of this contrast, we cannot but esteem the James of the Jewish party to have been the Apostle James. The book of the Acts, too, leads to the same conclusion. In the list of the apostles, Acts i. 13, we find the two well-known apostles of this name. The twelfth chapter relates the martyrdom of James the Great. Subsequently we find but one James spoken of (chap. xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18). Now it is quite natural, that after one James had been removed from the scene, the designation, the son of Alphaeus, should be omitted after the name of the other. But if a brother of the Lord had gradually attained great consideration, it is in the highest degree improbable that he should have meanwhile become an apostle, and still more so, that as an apostle he should have eclipsed this James, the son of Alphaeus (whom we besides already know as the Lord's brother). But it would be utterly impossible that his name should forthwith have become so exclusively renowned, that it should have no longer been found necessary to distinguish him from James the son of Alphaeus, if the latter were distinct from him.

¹ Compare Weiseler on the brethren of the Lord in Ullmann and Umbreit's *Studien und Kritiken* 1842, No. i. p. 84. 'The same Jewish Christians who denied the apostolic dignity of Paul, on account of his supposed deficiency in this respect when compared with the other apostles, although it was recognised by the latter, would then have placed James above the other apostles, in spite of the very same deficiency.'

When, finally, we consider the two epistles which have been attributed to the brethren of the Lord, we find no fresh grounds for the view which distinguishes these relatives of Jesus from the apostles. It has been remarked, that James, in his epistle, does not call himself an apostle, but a servant of God and of Jesus Christ. In answer to this, it is replied, that St John also does not call himself an apostle in his epistle. Probably the choice of the words, a servant of Jesus Christ, may have been caused, in the cases of both James and Jude, by a feeling of humility, which impelled them thus strongly to express their spiritual dependence upon Christ, in contrast with that honourable title which they bore in the Church. The author of the Epistle of Jude ingeniously styles himself the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James. He seems to desire indirectly to designate himself as the brother of Jesus, though his heart impels him first to announce his dependence upon Him. The expression, ‘of the holy apostles,’ ver. 17, cannot possibly be looked upon as excluding him from the apostles; for he is speaking of the apostles only in a very limited manner, viz., so far as they had beforehand announced to the Church, that in the last days there should be dangerous mockers. All the apostles, as such, can hardly be spoken of here; and least of all can they be mentioned in contrast to Jude. That the whole epistle entirely corresponds with the character of Lebbeus or Thaddeus, has already been mentioned.¹ Jesus, then, grew up

¹ The passage 1 Cor. ix. 5 only strengthens our view. When it is said, Have we not power to take with us a sister, as a wife, as the other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?—the brethren of the Lord evidently mark the first, and Cephas the second, degrees of an ascending series. But the brethren of the Lord could only form a gradation if they were also apostles. Peter, again, forms a gradation above them, as being both an apostle and the founder of the first church. If, then, the brethren of the Lord appear here as apostles, placed between Peter and the other apostles, it is evident that more than one are spoken of, as uniting these two qualifications; and therefore not only James, but also Jude. We should then here be obliged to place not merely James, but also Jude, as brethren of the Lord who were not apostles, above the apostles, unless we take the passage in its plain and simple sense. In the passage 1 Cor. xv. 5–7, the sentences: Christ appeared to Cephas—*εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα*: to James—*εἶτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις*, are entirely parallel. If in the latter case James is to be distinguished from the apostles, Cephas must equally be distinguished from the Twelve

in a remarkable household, which had been fashioned by the storms of life, by want, and by love. Two sisters-in-law of similar names were the matrons of the circle. The children of Cleophas, with whom Jesus lived as brothers and sisters, seem to have manifested the same upright, sensible, and decided kind of character which distinguished Joseph, but to have had but little mental riches or profundity. They were no blood-relations of Jesus. Without imputing direct blame to these relatives, or in any way impugning their sincerity and worth, we may say that the sorrows which the mother of Jesus and her Son may have experienced in such a circle, are written in their secret history. This connection was a sad, yet blessed necessity. Jesus, however, in His dying hour, felt it most suited to His mother's feelings to give her John for a son. Paul was on the most friendly terms with the Lord's brother, though his disposition formed the greatest contrast to his own.¹ It was the advice of this James which brought about the catastrophe of his life. It was not without deliberation that the early Church received into the canon the epistles of the Lord's brethren; and even Luther ventured upon a severe condemnation of the Epistle of James. It was certainly from no family partiality that Jesus made these temperate but sincere characters, James and Jude, pillars of His Church. He used them as instruments of spreading His Gospel, for those who were zealous for the law, not only in Israel, but in all the world; well knowing, that there were numbers who could only be reached by such instrumentality. But their special vocation was to watch against all dissoluteness and antinomianism; and these errors they opposed like heroes, Jude attacking the former, and James the latter.

According to Mark vi. 3,² the Nazarenes called Jesus Himself 'the carpenter.' In Matthew the term is exchanged for 'the carpenter's son' (xiii. 53). The tradition of the early Church, however, agrees with Mark in the belief that Jesus, in His youth, practised the trade of His father. Apocryphal writ-

¹ Comp. the concluding words of the above-named work of Schaf, pp. 90 ff.

² Origen, in opposing Celsus, states that in the Gospels which were spread in the Church, Jesus was Himself called τέκτων. See Lachmann, *Nov. Test.*, Mark vi. 3.

ings describe Him as fashioning all kinds of wooden vessels.¹ Justin Martyr relates, that Jesus made ploughs and yokes, thereby exhibiting symbols of righteousness, and inculcating an active life.² This tradition, however, cannot be regarded as an historical certainty. But neither, on the other hand, can we raise any objection to the view, that Jesus should have laboured as an artisan. It has been remarked, that among the Jews no idea of degradation was attached to handicraft; even Paul practised a trade. Such an observation may facilitate our conception of the youthful activity of Jesus. But it must not be forgotten, that even a mind like that of Jacob Böhm the cobbler could, though in an aristocratic age, number noblemen among his pupils. If Christ really worked as a mechanic, He ennobled labour; that He who ennobled even the death of the innocent upon the accursed tree should be degraded by such a circumstance, can be a cause of anxiety only to the weakest minds. We may indeed suppose that it was in an ideal state of mind that He fashioned His vessels of wood, and that yokes and ploughs would become symbols in His hands. The sons of Alpheus, however, who with Jewish pride saw in Him the glory of Israel, who was to be manifested to the world (John vii. 4, xiv. 22), would hardly have suffered Him to work much. It may also have frequently occurred, that during His journeys to the festivals He passed some time in a circle of chosen ones, or that days and nights spent upon the mountain solitudes of Galilee in profound contemplation and fervent prayer, flew by as but an instant, in communion with God, in whom a thousand years are as one day. The forty days' sojourn in the wilderness, which represents one single meditation or act of devotion, leads to the conclusion that He had before been frequently in a similar state of unconsciousness of the lapse of time.³ Thus, even in His youth, He was accustomed to the solemn loneliness of night, to the solitary ways of the Spirit amid desert solitudes, in which the heart is so susceptible of the secret influences of the all-

¹ Comp. Strauss, *Leben Jesu*, vol. i. p. 322.

² *Dialog. c. Tryph.* 88. Neander and others seem to find three kinds of vessels mentioned in the passage in question—ploughs, yokes, and scales.

³ In the life of Socrates we meet with an instance of this intensity of contemplation. He stands for a surprisingly long time on one spot, lost in reflection upon a problem.

present and living God. In the freedom of this course of life, which we claim for the Lord's youthful years, and which Mary and her foster-family would themselves undoubtedly claim for Him, His bodily activity could not have been very great. His self-consciousness was strong enough to let Him allow Himself to be cared for in temporal things, by those who became through Him acquainted with a blessedness of which, but for Him, they could have formed no conception.

If we now finally inquire into the extent of Christ's worldly means, and consider Him, at one time, as quite poor, because His parents brought the offering of the poor in the temple, or because He had not where to lay His head; at another, as in prosperity, perhaps because He wore a seamless coat, or for similar reasons; we should, above all things, well consider that the glaring difference between poor and rich which prevailed in the old æon had no signification for Him. He knew neither the cares nor the desires which make the poor wretched; in communion with God, and in the abundance of His love, He was the richest of kings. And though He had possessed the richest of inheritances, He would still have been among the poorest, since He could have kept nothing for Himself. In communion with His Father, and His spiritual family whom He met with everywhere, He never felt want. But the riches in presence of which all want disappears, are a mysterious possession, a Messianic treasury, not to be estimated according to rates of worldly property.

NOTES.

1. Our view of the family of Jesus is as follows:—

(1.) Cleophas was (according to Hegesippus) the brother of Joseph.

(2.) Mary was his wife, and therefore sister-in-law to the mother of Jesus (John xix. 25).

(3.) This Mary was (according to Mark xv. 40; comp. John xix. 25) the mother of James the Less, and of Joses.

(4.) This James, called the Less to distinguish him from James the Great in the apostolic catalogue, must therefore be identical with James the son of Alphaeus.

(5.) James the Less survived his parents as an apostle. When the Epistle of Jude was written, the other James was

already dead. The author of the Epistle of Jude calls himself the brother of James. This designation makes it probable that he was the same Jude whom Luke calls, in the apostolic catalogue (vi. 16), Jude of James.

Thus these apostolic men, James, Joses, and Jude, appear to have been brothers, sons of Alpheus, and in a civil sense, cousins of our Lord.

(6.) According to Matthew xiii. 55, the brothers of Jesus are called James, Joses, Simon, and Judas. His sisters are only mentioned, and not named. In Mark vi. 3, the order is James, Joses, Judas, and Simon; the first three names coinciding with those of the three sons of Alpheus.

(7.) According to Hegesippus and Eusebius, Simeon, a son of Cleophas, suffered martyrdom under Trajan, as Bishop of Jerusalem. Consequently, the fourth among the brethren of Jesus is also found among the sons of Alpheus, and there can be no doubt that the sons of Alpheus were the brethren of Jesus.

(8.) They were, in a legal sense, not merely cousins, but brothers, if Joseph had adopted them as the orphan children of his deceased brother. That such adoptions were not uncommon, is proved by the circumstance that Christ enjoined one even on the cross.

2. By the brethren of Jesus, mentioned Acts i. 14, as distinct from the apostles, may be understood Joses and Simon.

3. The assumption that the names of Alpheus and Cleophas are identical, is claimed by Schaf in the corrections at the conclusion of the above-named brochure. He remarks first, that it is striking that it should be John (xix. 25) who uses the Aramæan, and Matthew and Mark (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18) the Greek form. This difference may be easily explained. The expression, Mary of Cleophas, belonged to the Hebrew family tradition of the apostles; they seldom used it, and had no need to give it a Greek form. It was otherwise with the expression, James of Alpheus. The name James was one which the apostles were everywhere repeating within the sphere of the Church, and which they could not therefore but translate into its general language. The same circumstance explains the author's second scruple, that Luke has both forms; for, on one occasion, he gives the name according to the form in which it would naturally appear in the græcized apostolic catalogue (vi. 15), on the other,

he is relating an occurrence, to whose vivid representation it was more appropriate that the name of Cleophas, who is introduced as a speaker, should not be exchanged for Alpheus.¹

¹ [Both here and in Germany opinion is still very much divided regarding the brethren of our Lord. Equally competent investigators have ranged themselves on opposite sides, and men who elsewhere agree, here differ. Besides the Bible Dictionaries, we may refer to Greswell's *Dissertations on the Harmony* (Diss. xvii.) for a defence of the opinion that our Lord's brethren were the children of Joseph and Mary; and for a very full and able advocacy of the other opinion, to Mill's *Myth. Interpretation*, pp. 219-274. A very impartial statement of the question is given by Riggenbach (*Vorlesungen über das Leben Jesu*, p. 286, etc.). The following words of Andrews (*Life of our Lord*, p. 107) deserve to be quoted: 'It is evident from this brief survey of the chief opinions respecting the Lord's brethren and their relations to Jesus, that the data for a very positive judgment are wanting. There can be no doubt that the very general, although not universal, opinion in the Church, has been in favour of the perpetual virginity of Mary. In regard to the Lord's brethren, there were some in very early times who thought them the children of Joseph and Mary, but most thought them to be either his cousins, or the children of Joseph. It is difficult to tell which of the latter two opinions is the elder, or best supported by tradition. The words of Calvin on Matt. i. 25 deserve to be kept in mind: *Certe nemo unquam hac de re quæstionem movebit nisi curiosus; nemo vero pertinaciter insistet nisi contentiosus rixator.*'—ED.]

END OF VOLUME I.

Just Published, in One Vol. 8vo, *Second Edition*, Price 10s. 6d.,

The Gospel History;

A Compendium of Critical Investigations in support of the Historical Character of the Four Gospels. By Dr. J. H. A. EBRARD, Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. Translated by JAMES MARTIN, B.A. Revised and Edited by A. B. BRUCE.

[*From the British and Foreign Evangelical Review, February 1864.*]

‘NOTHING could have been more opportune than the re-publication in English of this admirable work. It has long been highly valued in Germany, and has done most effective service against the many assailants of the Gospels in that country. Its arguments are chiefly levelled against the mythical hypothesis of Strauss, and the destructive criticism of the Tübingen school. But although originally composed with the view of maintaining the true historic character of the Gospels, and their apostolic origin, against the assaults led by Baur and Strauss, the reasoning of the author will be found equally valid in the present warfare with M. Renan. We are heartily glad that such a thorough and comprehensive work on the vital subject of the Gospels should at this moment have been presented to the British public, and we anticipate much good from it, in view of the attacks which have already been made, and which will doubtless for a time be continued, on the inestimably precious records of our Saviour’s life.

‘The plan of Dr Ebrard leads him

to divide his work into two parts, the first treating of the contents of the four Gospels, and the second dealing with the critical questions connected with their authorship and origin. In both divisions we have much valuable information conveyed in a somewhat livelier style than is common among German writers.

‘The utter insufficiency as well as arbitrariness of the life of Jesus as set forth by Strauss, is powerfully exposed. Many of the remarks (p. 476, etc.) are as applicable to the legendary hypothesis, now suggested by M. Renan, as to the mythical theory of his predecessor. We strongly recommend those who are at all startled by the speculations of this last infidel life of Jesus, to read the answers here given to the far abler work of Strauss, and they will soon feel that infidelity has already done its worst, and that any new attack upon the Gospels need cause no apprehension.

‘The whole work is so translated and edited as to merit our warm commendation.’

Edinburgh : T. and T. CLARK. London : HAMILTON and Co.

DR LANGE'S COMMENTARIES.

Just Published. *Third Thousand,*

Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospels of St Matthew and St Mark.

Specially Designed and Adapted for the use of Ministers and Students. By J. P. LANGE, D.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Bonn. Translated from the German. 3 vols. 8vo. L.I., 11s. 6d.

Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St Luke.

Specially Designed and Adapted for the use of Ministers and Students. By Dr J. VAN OOSTERZEE. Edited by J. P. LANGE, D.D. Translated from the German. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.

Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles.

Specially Designed and Adapted for the use of Ministers and Students. By Dr C. LECHLER and K. GEROK. Edited by J. P. LANGE, D.D. Translated from the German. Vol. I., 10s. 6d. Vol. II. will be published in October.

‘THE method which Professor Lange pursues in his Commentary, makes it exceedingly valuable both in an exegetical and practical point of view. Having portioned out the original narrative of the Evangelist into sections, according to the contents and connection of the passage, he subjects it to a threefold handling, in order to bring out the meaning and applications of the text. First of all we have a series of *critical notes*, intended to deal with the difficulties in the interpretation of the passage, and bringing all the aids which exegesis supplies to elucidate and exhibit its proper meaning. Next we have a series of *doctrinal reflections*, suggested by the passage interpreted, and intended to exhibit the substance of the scriptural truths which it contains. And lastly, we have a series of *homiletical hints*, founded on the passage elucidated.’—*Daily Review*.

‘THE critical notes are, for the most part, judicious, and in many instances they throw a vast amount of light upon the meaning of the sacred text. The doctrinal reflections are generally brief; but they are not on that account the less valuable, for their brevity is owing, not to the scantiness of matter contained in them, but to the condensed form in which that matter is presented. The homiletical hints contain many beautiful germs of thought, with a very remarkable freedom from the vain and fanciful interpretations that are sometimes given to the words of sacred Scripture. . . . These “Hints,” partly original and partly selected from other authors, whose names are appended, combine variety with naturalness, and are well worthy of the attention of the two classes of persons for whom they are specially designed and adapted.’—*Witness*.

Edinburgh : T. and T. CLARK. London : HAMILTON and Co.

[illegible]

PRINTED IN U.S.A.



BS2420 .L275 v.1

The life of the Lord Jesus Christ: a

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00077 1966